1.23.29

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division DF214

Section H74

V. 1

THE HISTORY OF GREECE

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 23 1929
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE

HISTORY OF GREECE

FROM

ITS COMMENCEMENT TO THE CLOSE OF
THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE
GREEK NATION

BY

ADOLPH HOLM

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

IN FOUR VOLUMES

VOL. I

UP TO THE END OF THE SIXTH CENTURY B.C.

London
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND NEW YORK
1894

All rights reserved

PREFACE

I SHOULD not have complied with the request of my publisher, who has done so much for the study of antiquity, to write a short history of Greece, if I had not been convinced that a new history would be of some use to those who are interested in the subject. The circumstances of the case and the scope of my own abilities precluded that criticism of the nicest minutiae of research, for which Grote and Duncker are remarkable, as well as the harmony and charm of the narrative of Curtius. On the other hand, it seemed to me to be both possible and profitable to do more than has hitherto been done in the way of, firstly, treating the most important facts in a comparatively narrow compass, and secondly, bringing into clear relief what may be regarded as proved and what as hypothesis. This is what I have endeavoured to accomplish.

The historian himself must decide what facts are important. What he has to do is to draw a picture of the past. I have inserted many passages in the text at a late stage, and have run my pen through many which were composed at the outset. On the whole, it is evident that in a historical narrative neither the general coherence of the whole nor the characteristic element in the details can be neglected. Hence in Greek

history we cannot exclude details, not even in cases when we know for a certainty that they are not quite correct. But the general outlines must also be emphasized, and this I have taken great pains to do. In this respect much depends upon the division of the subject-matter. I have therefore written somewhat short chapters, each of which is intended to form as complete a whole as possible, although they may differ from one another in point of style, using argument or narrative just as the subject seemed to require.

One point, however, must not be overlooked here. The historian cannot relate the history of an important nation unless he has formed a distinct conception of its character. This estimate not only influences his judgment, but also his choice of incident. My views of the Greek character will appear from this volume. If I may be allowed to epitomize them here from one definite standpoint, I would say that I do not, as so many do, regard the Greeks as a people which in the most important phases of life always hit upon the best or nearly the best course of action, but I certainly consider them an exceptionally high type of humanity, as the great seekers after perfection among the nations, possessing all the qualities which necessarily belong to the indefatigable inquirer, animated, I may say, with the spirit which filled Lessing. Where circumstances allowed it, they became inventors, and to be inventors even in one or two provinces is a great glory.

This view has guided me also in my estimate of the great men among the Greeks. In their political life also the Greeks are in my opinion to be regarded pre-eminently as inquirers; even the greatest Athenian statesmen did not always find the best solution of the problem before them. Here, too, it is the intellectual activity in itself, so marked not only

in their achievements but also in the aspirations of the people whose needs they had to satisfy, that specially commands our admiration.

I have also endeavoured to make the text of my Greek history a miniature reproduction of the materials at my disposal by observing the following rules: I make definite assertions only where the authorities allow it, and express myself in doubtful terms when there is more or less uncertainty. This is not the usual method of procedure in the present day. But a historian of the first rank, Droysen, has recently declared that he can no longer give an unqualified approval to the method, so useful for enhancing the charm and force of a narrative, which represents the conclusions of research as historical facts.

As regards the critical side of the work, I had to keep in view the fact that it was to be a history and not merely a series of inquiries. The writer of a Greek history must have made researches in various departments, but he cannot have made them in all, or he would be writing merely for a very limited circle of specialists. The author of the present work goes so far as to think that we students of Greek history are too isolated one from the other even in criticism, and that we consequently lose sight of the whole more than we should do. We engage in the examination of original authorities, but we do not bring it to much fruit; we take our stand on the principles of the historical method, but do not agree as to its application. The case is quite different in other branches of science. The archaeologist forms an opinion on the style of works of art, and upon it builds up his history of art. The philologist classifies manuscripts, and so constructs the text of his editions. We on the other hand analyse

writers, but in most cases not in order to fashion the narrative accordingly, but to create an ideal Ephorus or Theopompus, who even then is doomed to a brief existence, since he acquires a fresh aspect with every new treatise. Between these highly meritorious works, which have given a vigorous impulse to research, and the object in view, a history of Greece, there remains a great gulf fixed.

This is due not a little to the fact that the principles of historical criticism are too rarely discussed by us. Every one feels them and applies them in his own way, but frequently with exaggeration in one direction or another, which is natural enough, since each man has had to evolve them afresh for himself. There are *νόμοι ἄγραφοι*, and it is high time that we should agree on the most important of them at any rate. Among them I would place the following.

The investigation of original sources should no longer start, as has hitherto been generally the case, with the reconstruction of lost authors, but with a study of the peculiarities of the existing ones, which has been, comparatively speaking, neglected.

The higher criticism connected with this method, which has for its object the discovery of facts, must conform to rules, which can only be supplied by practice, and must be gathered from practice by sifting the materials used. In this respect the following points may be worthy of consideration.

The common criterion of the author's point of view, especially in politics, must be applied with care, as it may lead to partisanship and consequently inaccuracy. A list of ascertained cases of this description would be desirable.

The desire to explain customs, etc. by incidents that have happened (aetiological legends) is a frequent source of inven-

tion. But the forgery is not always equally clear. A collection of proved cases would enable us to form a better judgment as to the suspected ones.

There are many inventions made with a practical object. In Greece, owing to the want of ancient records and the contemporaneous existence of many states and corporations independent of one another, the proof of claims for territory and so forth often rested merely on traditional descent, which had its root in the religious conditions of ancient times. Hence such exploits as might be of use to their inventors were ascribed to recognized heroes, and heroes were sent upon journeys and were credited with arbitrarily chosen pedigrees, or new ones were even created. It is important that all these cases should be compiled and examined.

The recurrence of similar incidents in different ages justifies the supposition that these incidents only happened once, and were invented for the subsequent occasions, and in that case the earliest instance is probably an invention on the pattern of a subsequent event. On the other hand, nothing is better established than the fact that history repeats itself. Hence, such coincidences do not warrant the denial of any given fact. Here also it is only by collection and comparison of the different cases that we can arrive at practical results.

The rhetoric of a later age has often drawn a picture of the great deeds of the past which is quite unlike the reality, as is seen in the history of the Persian Wars. Systematically arranged instances would also be of use here. Many other points might thus be elucidated by enumeration and discussion of the particular instances. The practice hitherto followed of appealing in each separate case to a law, which

is presumed to be well known, but is of uncertain application, is unjustifiable, and at times leads to a needlessly sharp tone in criticism.

When works of this kind have been written, when all that obscures the truth in Greek history has been systematically investigated — just as (I might almost say) the philologist investigates phonetic changes in analogous cases — then, and not till then, will the treatment of the details of early Greek history yield the ripe fruit which the genius of gifted scholars often fails to produce.

In my choice of authorities I was obliged to put myself under the same limitations as with regard to the text. I have not always been able to indicate why I have differed from the ingenious views of modern investigators. And at times I have thought myself justified in quoting only the most useful modern works without citing the passages of the ancient authorities themselves.

Lastly, when I compare what I have accomplished with the aim I had in view, I see that much is imperfect, both in the details and in the composition as a whole. The endeavour to be brief may have prevented me from putting certain things in their proper light. When I have to combat the views of others, which seemed unavoidable in questions of importance, I trust that my brevity may in no way hide the feeling of respect which I have for my opponents of the moment.

ADOLPH HOLM.

NAPLES, *November* 1885.

NOTE

THE translators wish to express their obligation to the Author for having placed at their disposal some corrections and a number of valuable additions, which they have incorporated in the translation, and they have also to thank Mr. Frederick Clarke, late Taylorian Scholar in the University of Oxford, for thoroughly revising the MS. of their translation, and correcting the proofs.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1
NOTES 8

CHAPTER I

ORIGIN OF THE GREEKS—STANDARD OF CIVILIZATION OF THE RACE WHEN ENTERING ON ITS HISTORICAL HOME . 13
NOTES 21

CHAPTER II

THE COUNTRY 24
NOTES 30

CHAPTER III

UNCERTAINTIES OF EARLY GREEK HISTORY AND ATTEMPTS TO REMOVE THEM 31
NOTES 40

CHAPTER IV

EARLIEST TRADITIONAL HISTORY 44
NOTE 47

CHAPTER V

PAGE

Criticism of this Traditional History, especially of that Founded on Legend 48

Notes 52

CHAPTER VI

The Pelasgians. Tradition and Reality 55

Notes 60

CHAPTER VII

Other Nations of Ancient Greece: Leleges, Carians, Minyae. Supposed Advance of Civilization among the Earliest Greeks; the Heroic Ages; Ionians . 63

Notes 72

CHAPTER VIII

Remains of Early Art in Greece: Troy, Mycenae, Orchomenus, Tiryns 76

Notes 86

CHAPTER IX

Foreign Influence on Greece. Egypt, Phoenicia . . 91

Notes 99

CHAPTER X

The most Important Legends of Greece . . . 103

Notes 120

CHAPTER XI

PAGE
The Religion of the Greeks 122
Notes 134

CHAPTER XII

The Dorian Invasion. The Colonies in Asia Minor . 135
Notes 148

CHAPTER XIII

Civilization of the Asiatic Greeks. Homeric Poetry . 156
Notes 164

CHAPTER XIV

Institutions and Mode of Life of the Early Greeks, especially as described in Homer . . . 166
Notes 171

CHAPTER XV

European Greece: Sparta; the Constitution of Lycurgus; Customs of the Spartans 173
Notes 185

CHAPTER XVI

Sparta up to the Middle of the Seventh Century. The Messenian Wars 193
Notes 200

CHAPTER XVII

PAGE

Other Peloponnesian States, especially Argos. Pheidon. Sparta's Relations with Argos, Arcadia and Elis . 202

Notes 213

CHAPTER XVIII

Northern Greek States, especially Thessaly and Boeotia. Hesiod 217

Notes 224

CHAPTER XIX

Bonds of Union among the Greeks. Amphictyones, Oracles, Games 225

Notes 242

CHAPTER XX

Political Development of the Greek States: Monarchy, Aristocracy, Legislators, Tyrants . . . 251

Notes 264

CHAPTER XXI

Greek Colonization (preceded by a Notice of Greek Maritime States, especially in Asia Minor and Euboea). Colonies in Eastern Greece; in Western Greece—Magna Graecia, Sicily, Massalia, Cyrene . . 267

Notes 295

CHAPTER XXII

Corinth, Sicyon and Megara under the Tyrants . . 305

Notes 315

CHAPTER XXIII

PAGE

The Greeks of Asia Minor in Conflict with Lydia and Persia 319

Notes 334

CHAPTER XXIV

Growth of Greek Philosophy, Literature and Art in Asia Minor. First Steps of Architecture and Sculpture in Greece 339

Notes 357

CHAPTER XXV

Greater Greece and Sicily; their Politics and their Civilization 358

Notes 374

CHAPTER XXVI

Athens up to the Time of Solon. Legislation of Solon . 376

Notes 396

CHAPTER XXVII

Athens under Peisistratus and his Sons . . . 405

Notes 419

CHAPTER XXVIII

Athens in the Last Decade of the Sixth Century . 421

Notes 431

INTRODUCTION

THE Greeks are one of the most important links in the chain of nations which constitutes the history of the world. Few peoples have exercised so considerable an influence upon later generations, fewer still are in themselves objects of so deep an interest.

The Greeks are a pre-Christian people, and their religion is on a lower scale than the Christian; they differ essentially, however, from oriental nations in the relation in which their religion stands to their life. In the East we find influential priesthoods, which in some countries became a regular caste, and everywhere form a powerful order. These priesthoods are not merely ministers of the sacred rites, they are also the depositaries of the knowledge on which rests the development of the whole community, and they are the arbiters on questions of morals. That is not the case in Greece. There the priests had no lack of honour and influence of various kinds, but this influence carried no compulsion with it, and their position was in nowise a predominant one; they were not looked upon as men of higher rank, for their duties were confined to the performance of the service of the god, and in Greece divine service and the conduct of life were two primarily distinct things, only brought into closer relationship subsequently by the sound sense of the nation and the wisdom of its greatest men. The position of some of the

Oracles presents an exception, especially that of Delphi, in the period between the Dorian migration and the Persian Wars. But the Greeks never shrank from criticizing the proceedings of the Oracles. They were a moral and pious nation, but their piety and morality were the expression of a harmony instinctively felt by all, not the product of instruction by a higher authority. Their morality was controlled more by the State than by religious institutions. Hence freedom is the most marked characteristic of Hellenism, both in religion and in morality, the result being the possibility of an independent pursuit of knowledge.

But in politics freedom was no less a characteristic of the Greek nation. And here again the East forms a contrast. Despotic government and great empires are the general rule in the East. Greece on the other hand is distinguished by its small republics. The Greek state is an organized community controlling its own destinies.

But even this twofold freedom—freedom of the intellect and freedom in politics—is not sufficient to explain the position which the ancient Greeks held in the world. On the surface it is inadequate as a complete characterization of the Greeks, for the Romans possessed both kinds of freedom to a certain extent, although the intellectual spontaneity of the Roman people was far more limited, and their political freedom lost at an early stage that element which was so important in the development of Greece, the existence side by side of communities possessing equal power. The incompleteness of the definition is still more obvious when we consider the Greek mind in its most important expression.

The factor required to complete the characterization of the Greeks is their unique sense of beauty (*τὸ καλόν*). They produced masterpieces in literature and art, and generally speaking discovered, with but few exceptions, those types which are of universal application for the expression of the Beautiful. It is easy to see how greatly the development of

their artistic talents was promoted by the characteristics above mentioned, as opposed to the Orientals and the moderns. Hellenic literature and Hellenic art would be impossible in a Christian nation; but they were just as much so in the despotisms of the East. The well-nigh perfect forms of Greek art could only come into being under the aegis of the highest intellectual and political freedom. So ardent too were the Greeks in their pursuit of the Beautiful, that the same word served from earliest times to denote their moral ideal.

If the above is in essentials a correct description of the position of Greece in the world, that is to say, of her importance for all time, there remains still another point which alone accounts for her ability to bring her splendid talents to such perfection. This was her exceptional sense of the value of proportion. Σωφροσύνη, the real meaning of which is soundness of intellect, is the quality which distinguishes Greek art and literature from that of the East: it alone made the creation of classical forms possible. Without this sense of proportion the Greeks would often have preferred what was characteristic to the beautiful, and in many ways have given an exaggerated expression to their ideas.

It is scarcely necessary to mention here that full recognition of the importance of the Greeks does not necessarily imply crediting them with absolute perfection. It is obvious that a higher kind of religion, like the Christian, is bound to inspire works in literature and art surpassing in many respects those saturated by polytheism. Further, it is clear that our modern world, which has attacked psychological and social problems that were unknown to the ancients, is able to approach many subjects in a deeper spirit than was possible to the Greeks.

The same holds good in the department of morals, which includes that of politics. The Hellenic national character had certain faults from which even their finest minds were

not wholly free. They were produced by that very striving after individuality which was the source of their love of freedom. It has been said that they had very little idea of humanity in our sense of the word. So far as this is true (and we must not lose sight of the fact that philanthropy is a thoroughly Greek conception), it comes from their whole attitude towards life, which, generally speaking, was only of value to them in connection with their own little state. This may serve as an explanation of these cases of great cruelty in the treatment of a conquered foe which occur even in the best times of Greece.

In the domain of morals, on the other hand, the instinct of individualism and the dislike of constraint which were peculiar to the Greeks had this important consequence, that one and all, following the lead of their philosophers and poets, worked out their own self-improvement with a zeal and earnestness that bore splendid fruit, which we can only fully appreciate when we reflect that the result was attained without the aid of religious dogmas.[1]

One unique result of this decided bent of the Greeks towards spontaneity of thought and action is the number of peculiar and strongly-marked characters produced among them, which have in all ages justly attracted great interest. The great men of Greece, like her chief races, states, and parties, have shown their importance in the most varied ways, and we ought to try to comprehend the peculiar worth of each. Partisanship on the part of the modern observer, whether from a moral or a political point of view, however natural it may be, would often lead to unfairness. They are types of character which ought to be estimated as such.

The above remarks make it clear that a history of Greece should not separate the intellectual and artistic from the political element. An account dealing solely with the political development of Greece is not sufficient, for a history which misses the inner vital principle is incomplete. If we

wished to divide the history of the Greeks into two parts, the first part would show how they were affected by the principle of individualism, which was the mainspring of their actions, while the other would contain the development of their artistic talents. But a union of the two, and hence a complete history of Greece, is possible for the following reason.

With the Greeks the development of civic freedom and the forward march in pursuit of the ideal went hand in hand. Their independence and their artistic development attained their highest point at the same moment; and for both simultaneously began a period of decline, which lasted quite as long in respect to their political freedom as in the domain of art, for with the cessation of their importance in foreign politics, the Greeks by no means lost their internal freedom of action. That is why the history both of Greek culture and of Greek politics can be treated in close connection with one another.

What then are the chronological and geographical limits of Greek history? Into what epochs must it be divided? We should close with the battle of Chaeronea, if Greek liberty ceased with it. But that was not the case. Greece lost, it is true, her position in the politics of the world, but still retained some of her internal independence. Several Greek states were as independent after Chaeronea as before it, and in any case it appears hardly appropriate to exclude from the political history of Greece such events as the last attempt to infuse new life into the Spartan community, and the creation of the federate states of the Achaeans and Aetolians. We must therefore go as far as the destruction of Corinth. The geographical boundaries vary at different periods. Wherever Greek life goes on there is the scene of Greek history, which deals at one time with Egypt, at another with the Crimea, and again with Gaul, according as Naucratis or Panticapaeum or Massalia rises into importance. The want of a permanent political centre increases the difficulty of the task, but such a centre is

not always absent. In Greece it pretty often happens that some state takes the lead in politics, generally Sparta, occasionally Athens, more rarely Thebes and the Leagues. Around their fortunes cluster those of the rest of Greece.

According to our view Greek history falls into four periods. The first deals at the outset with ethnographical, and subsequently with critical questions. We find a traditional history, which we have to examine in order to extract what is certain, which, as regards the earliest epoch, consists of definite phenomena of civilization. The Greeks began their political life with an ideal unity resting in part on a religious basis. Very soon they display an extraordinary power of expansion, and exhibit great regularity in the development of their states. In the earlier centuries civilization is found more in the outlying states than at the centre. Of the two most important states of Greece, Sparta very early provided herself with a definite constitution, while Athens only made her importance felt towards the end of the period. The first period of Greek history, which goes down to the end of the sixth century before Christ, is therefore concerned with the formation of the Greek race and the Greek character (500 B.C.).

The second period opens with a great attack directed against Greece simultaneously from the East and the West, which was brilliantly repulsed both in Hellas and in Sicily. These victories brought Greece to its political and intellectual prime, but the blossom contained the germ of decay. What made Greece great, its variety of states rivalling each other in importance, was also the cause of its ruin. Dorians and Ionians fought in the East as in the West. In the East Ionian Athens, in the West Dorian Syracuse, for a long time held the supremacy. In the struggle the Dorian won, but with Athens remains the glory of having brought every germ of Greek greatness in the intellectual sphere to perfection. Here too, of course, a change is visible; the downward path has commenced.

Yet the first achievements on this level are still great. Euripides is a worthy rival of Sophocles. The second period of Greek history, which includes the fifth century before Christ, contains therefore both the culminating point of Greek development and the beginning of its decline (500-404 B.C.).

In the third period we find Sparta most influential in the East and centre, and then Thebes, both of whom have to face the power of Persia. In the West, supremacy falls to Syracuse, whose policy is influenced by her relations with Carthage. But both in the East and in the West, northern races appear on the scene. Those in the West, however, are for the present repulsed, but in the East the semi-foreign monarchy of Macedonia wins the day and deprives the Greek republics of all political importance abroad. Hence this third period contains the last revival of Greek political life and the defeat of the small Greek states in the East (404-338 B.C.).

In the fourth period we see how Greece tends to become more and more a plaything of the Macedonians, while the Greek people under Macedonian leadership carry their civilization to the East. In the West the Greek colonies hold their own against Carthage, but submit to Rome, which finally subjugates Greece itself. Hence, the fourth, often known as the Hellenistic period, from the battle of Chaeronea to the destruction of Corinth by Mummius, embraces the spread of Hellenism among great peoples of foreign origin, and her last attempts at independent government. The municipal independence of the Hellenic communities was preserved under the Roman rule, especially in the East (338-146 B.C.).

The conception of a history of Greece belongs only to recent times. The Greeks themselves might have conceived the idea, since they contrasted Hellenism with barbarism; but we find no Greek history written by a Greek; even Ephorus wrote chronicles of the Hellenes and the Barbarians. In modern times Englishmen were the first to write histories of Greece, and even after the brilliant performances of Germany,

especially the artistic perfection of E. Curtius' work, and the masterly criticism and exegesis of M. Duncker's history, which unfortunately only embraces a part of the whole, the exhaustive history of Grote still deserves special recognition as a model of careful investigation of detail, and of deep insight both into the politics and character of the Greeks.[2]

NOTES

1. This intellectual activity is shown in Greek literature in the pervading tone of reflection and discussion, which differs widely from the dogmatical tone usual in the present day. We find it in Greek art from the moment when this art can be recognized as such. We find it also in their politics, and though we may be far from regarding the achievements of the Greeks in this respect as models for imitation, we can appreciate their constant endeavours to create more perfect forms for their political institutions. For this love of proportion, cf. Polyb. v. 90 *τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν ἑκάστοις τηρεῖν ὅσῳ πλεῖστον διαφέρουσιν Ἕλληνες τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων.*

2. In our notes we intend to give only the most necessary literary references, and to quote only the most important passages of the original authorities and of modern writers. A history of the Greek historians, be they ancient or modern, is as far from being the subject of this work as a complete history of literature. Our selection is everywhere subjective ; we are prepared for the reproach of having omitted to notice some important fact, or of having overlooked the latest contribution to the subject ; the truth being that in many cases we did not see our way to make the reference sufficiently brief. As a preliminary guide to the aids to the study of Greek history and the character of this work, we make the following remarks. Of modern works on Greek history (as to which compare the article of W. Vischer on The Latest Works of Greek History in his Kl. Schriften, Band I., Lpz. 1877, and J. P. Mahaffy's Problems in Greek History, Lond. 1892), the following three must unquestionably be consulted :—G. Grote, History of Greece, 12 vols., London, 1846-55 and later editions, German translation, 2nd edition, 6 vols., Berlin, 1880 ; E. Curtius, Griechische Geschichte, 3 Bde., Berlin, 1857, seq., and in various revised editions, embodying the latest researches ; M. Duncker, Geschichte des Alterthums, Bd. V.–VII., editions 3–5, Lpz.

1881-82, and Neue Folge, Bd. I., Lpz. 1884. Besides these, THIRLWALL, History of Greece, and of more modern works, DURUY, especially important on account of his excellent plates; BUSOLT, Griechische Geschichte, Neue Aufl., Bd. I., 1893; E. ABBOTT, History of Greece, Vols. I. and II. PERCY GARDNER'S book, New Chapters in Greek History, Lond. 1892, is very instructive. W. W. FOWLER, The City State of the Greeks and Romans, London, 1893, is an excellent introduction to Greek history. The Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἔθνους ὑπὸ Κ. Παπαρρηγοπούλου. Ἔκδ. β'. Ἀθην. 1881, is also valuable. Besides these the student will not fail to consult special works, especially OTTFR. MÜLLER'S Orchomenus and Dorians, both models of penetration and learning. E. MEYER, Geschichte des Alterthums, 1 Bd., Geschichte des Orients bis zur Gründung des Perserreiches, Stuttg. 1884, will serve as an excellent introduction.

In chronology our chief authority is Eusebius, in the latest edition by A. SCHÖNE (Eus. Chronicorum libri II. Berol. 1875-76). Of modern chronological works are to be noticed:—H. F. CLINTON, Fasti Hellenici, Oxford, 1827, seq., in 3 parts—(1) To the LV. Olympiad, (2) To the CXXIII. Olymp., (3) To the death of Augustus, where the Fasti Romani begin. In Germany the first part of Clinton's book has been translated by FISCHER and SOETBEER, Griechische Zeittafeln Alt. 1840, Part II. by K. W. KRÜGER (in Latin), Lpz. 1830. Very serviceable are C. PETER'S Zeittafeln der griech. Geschichte, 4 Aufl., Halle, 1873; many details have been cleverly treated by UNGER in various articles. Our study of the original authorities is made much easier by the excellent collection of Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, by C. MÜLLER, published by F. Didot in Paris in 5 vols., text and Latin translation. The use of ancient writers as authorities for Greek history is of course dependent upon definite views as to the value of the person in question, *i.e.* as to his love of truth and accuracy. In the case of ancient authors who do not write as eye-witnesses, it is desirable to know something of the sources used by them. In this respect many laborious researches have been made of late. But this method has not resulted in any general agreement, which would render it possible to apply the results in a practical manner to the re-construction of important portions of Greek history. And here another point must be noticed. It appears that the view which has prevailed for some time, viz. that the learned historians of antiquity were to a great extent copyists, and that in Plutarch, for instance, it is possible to distinguish almost verbatim the authorities which he used, is now recognized as a mistaken one. The writer of this work has

endeavoured to the utmost of his power to contribute to this change of opinion. It is, however, not so easy as one is inclined to think, to distinguish the trustworthy authorities in extant writers, and thus the formation of a historical narrative depends mainly upon the tact of the modern investigator. And even if an authority is recognized as somewhat untrustworthy, it is nevertheless not always advisable to reject all his statements on principle. Only when you think you can prove how and why a certain fact, which is evidently correctly represented by some writers, is misrepresented by others, is it expedient to take no notice of the latter. The best summary of authorities is given by A. SCHAEFER in his Abriss der Quellenkunde der griechischen und römischen Geschichte, 1. Abth. Griechische Geschichte bis auf Polybius, 3 Aufl., Lpz. 1882.

Greek history is treated from a special and highly important point of view in the works upon the records of Greek antiquity, among which, besides the latest by GILBERT (Handbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer I., Lpz. 1881), may be prominently mentioned the attractive volumes of SCHOEMANN, a fluent exposition by a thorough scholar (Griechische Alterthümer, 2 Bde., Weidmann), and the work of C. FR. HERMANN, very useful for its excellent literary references and collection of passages, which now appears in a new edition. Many articles in Pauly's Realencyclopädie (a new revised edition of which will shortly be published) are excellent, especially when treating of reference passages ; the English dictionaries of Smith, especially the biographical and geographical articles, 5 vols. in all, are also serviceable. Of works on Inscriptions, it is sufficient to mention the Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum and the Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum, with the two latest handbooks, the Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions by E. L. HICKS, Oxf. 1882, and GUIL. DITTENBERGER'S Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, Lips. 1883 ; also an excellent article by NEWTON in his Essays on Art and Archaeology, 1880, and S. REINACH, Traité d'Epigraphie grecque, Par. 1885, as well as the German, French, and Hellenic journals published at Athens—Mittheilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts in Athen—Bulletin de correspondance hellénique—Ἐφημερὶς ἀρχαιολογική, all of which so constantly enrich our store of inscriptions, and the Journal of Hellenic Studies, London.

Mionnet's laborious and comprehensive work is no longer adequate for the important subject of Numismatics, now being erected on new foundations by the labours of men like Friedländer, Imhoof, Head, Von Sallet, Six, Waddington, and others. The Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum, now being

gradually published, of which the parts bearing on Italy, Sicily, and a portion of Northern and Central Greece, as well as Asia and Egypt, have already appeared, will be of most service. An excellent summary is given by BARCLAY V. HEAD in his Coins of the Ancients, London (Br. Mus.), 1882 ; with 70 plates. The incomplete work of F. LENORMANT, La monnaie dans l'antiquité, contains much that is valuable. IMHOOF'S Monnaies grecques, Paris, 1883, and his Porträtköpfe auf antiken Münzen hellen. Völker, Lpz. 1885, are a rich mine for the historian ; very instructive also is Types of Greek Coins, by PERCY GARDNER, Cambridge, 1883, 1 vol. 4°, with 16 plates. Compare, lastly, HULTSCH, Metrologie, 2 Aufl. For assistance in Greek Geography see Chap. II.

Mythology, the history of art, and the study of monuments cannot be specially noticed here. The best aids to these subjects are the works of W. H. ROSCHER, Lexikon der Mythologie, Lpz., A. BAUMEISTER, Denkmäler des klassischen Alterthums, Munich, DAREMBURG and SAGLIO, Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines, Paris, now in course of publication. A good preparation for the study of Greek art is afforded by those parts of the Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité, by PERROT and CHIPIEZ, which treat of the East, Paris, Hachette, 1881, seq., of which the three volumes hitherto published include Egypt, Chaldea, Assyria, Phoenicia, and Cyprus. Compare also (we purposely refrain from citing works of long standing) the new History of Ancient Sculpture by L. M. MITCHELL, and that by COLLIGNON, Vol. I., Paris, 1892 ; also, A. S. MURRAY'S Handbook of Greek Archaeology, Lond. 1892 ; and DURM'S Handbuch der Architectur, Bd. I., Die Baukunst der Griechen, 2 Aufl., Darmst. 1892 (Durm for original designs). The introductory remarks by KEKULE to the volumes of Baedeker's Greece and Italy are excellent. For the history of literature consult the well-known works of O. MÜLLER (new edition by Heitz), BERNHARDY, BERGK, and BLASS ; for philosophy, ZELLER ; an important section of Greek life is treated in masterly style in L. SCHMIDT'S Ethik der alten Griechen, 2 Bde., Berl. 1882. Compare also the lecture of E. CURTIUS on the historical faculty of the Greeks, in his Alterthum und Gegenwart, Berl. 1877, and his other essays on various topics of Greek antiquity. S. REINACH'S Manuel de Philologie classique, 2nd ed. 2 vols., Par. 1884, is useful in many ways ; and so is IWAN MÜLLER'S Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft, Nördl. 1885, which is being prepared by distinguished specialists, and will probably reach seven volumes. To keep abreast of the results of the latest researches, the best bibliographical and critical

aids are the journals published by S. Calvary at Berlin :—the Jahresbericht by Bursian-Müller, the Bibliotheca Philologica, and the Berlin Philologische Wochenschrift.

Lastly, by way of illustrating our method of criticism, we would draw attention to the fact that the Greeks possessed in an eminent degree the "Lust am Fabuliren." This was the source of their mythical narratives, and also of a considerable part of the details of their later history. The tales in Greek history have been lately brought into notice by Erdmannsdörfer. In their anecdotes of historical times chronology is often violated, and the nominal characters are not always the right ones ; but there is generally at bottom something characteristic, either of the period or of the race, in these anecdotes, and in this sense they are not to be despised ; indeed the best of them are bits of real history. As a poet often describes a historical character more correctly than a historian, and as an artist's landscape is often truer than a literal copy of nature, so the best anecdotes, *e.g.* those about Solon and Croesus, or about the wooers of Agariste, are truer in spirit than many a fact ingeniously established by scientific methods. This is the reason of the great importance of Herodotus for the study of Greek life, although we must not consider him as an authority for the history of the times before 500 B.C., of which he could not possibly know anything, such as the condition of the Greeks before the Dorian Invasion, or for accuracy in the matter of dates. An excellent aid to the study of Herodotus as a source of history is found in the notes of Stein's edition (Weidmann). But it is impossible in a compendious work of this kind to mention all the ingenious and painstaking modern endeavours to supplement our knowledge of Greek history before the year 500, and to remodel the traditions of that period. There are so many that two totally different Greek histories could be manufactured out of them. We do not believe that the prevailing practice of blending mere conjecture and ancient tradition into a connected whole, with little or nothing in the way of fact to support it, is suitable for Greece, especially the Greece of the earliest ages. What is transmitted by antiquity as fact is no doubt often pure invention, and occasionally not so valuable as modern theories ; but there always remains the possibility that there may be genuine facts in the mass of matter handed down by the ancients. We hold, therefore, that the narrative should clearly distinguish between tradition and modern conjecture. This is what we have endeavoured to do.

CHAPTER I

ORIGIN OF THE GREEKS—STANDARD OF CIVILIZATION OF THE RACE WHEN ENTERING ON ITS HISTORICAL HOME

THE foundations of Greek history rest in an ethnographical unity. Originally, and as a rule, only those tribes which were closely related to each other shared in the civilization of Greece. The distinguishing mark of their relationship is here, as everywhere, language; but it is not sufficient proof in every case. For although the established rule is that kindred speech implies kindred peoples, there occur instances in which it does not apply. But generally speaking the rule holds good, and should descent and language really contradict one another, we may assume that civilization has triumphed over nationality, and changed the character of the people. But this is not the only difficulty. In the case of Greece there is another, consisting of the fact of its language being known to us through its literature, while we know comparatively little of the popular dialects. But the vagueness of the political boundaries of Greece makes it desirable to know for certain whether the people of some frontier districts really spoke Greek or not, so as to increase or reduce the space allotted to them in history. But such knowledge is not always attainable. We may include countries in Greece which do not belong to it, and exclude others which are really Greek.[1] Again, our scanty knowledge of the tribal dialects of ancient Greece involves other disadvantages. Language reveals to us

much of a people's character.[2] But if our knowledge is more or less confined to the written language, then it is defective in this respect. It is true that literature is the flower of a language, but to be able to appreciate its real wealth we ought to possess an intimate acquaintance with the tribal dialects.

Still, in spite of these drawbacks, the study of the Greek language affords us invaluable aid in deciphering Greek character and history, and language is in fact our only authority for the earliest ages.

It is certain that what we now call different peoples were at first only tribes of the same race. These tribes left their home as population increased and more room was needed, and so in course of time became separate peoples. Hence in earlier times nations lived in closer connection with their kith and kin. Who these kinsmen were we gather from their language. It is therefore possible to get some idea of the direction of the movements of a nation whose language we know. But these philological studies have yet another advantage. We learn from them the degree of civilization attained by a people at a time when they were still living with their kinsfolk, and also what they brought with them from the common home of their fathers. If, for instance, we find a word in a language expressing the conception of "agriculture," and that word also occurs in the kindred languages of other peoples, there is a strong probability that this people were acquainted with the pursuit denoted by this word before they separated from their kinsfolk. In this way we can also find out what the country was from which the people migrated. Thus does philology assist the history of civilization. In this department, and especially since the time of A. Kuhn and Jacob Grimm, valuable researches have been made concerning the peoples of Europe and the races connected with them. Language has proved more and more a rich mine of discovery for early history, although in point of detail much is still contested and uncertain.

The following are the questions to which we desire an answer for Greece. To what other peoples were the Greeks related, and in what degree of descent? By what route did the Greeks enter the countries which they inhabited in historic times? To what degree of civilization had they attained when they settled there?

Philology alone can at present answer these questions. For although a partial answer to the third might be expected from what are called prehistoric studies, yet these studies are not sufficiently advanced to warrant the hope of any important result in Greek history. Even if more primitive tombs and implements had been discovered in Greece than has hitherto been the case, we should still be far from knowing with the required certainty whether in individual cases the degree of civilization proved by them was that of early Greeks, or of later members of the family who had lagged behind in the march of progress, or even of foreigners. Many more such discoveries are required to arrive by this method at results which could be included in a short history of Greece.[3] For the present it is only the science of language that has been able to answer these questions even in part.

Of the races with which we are really acquainted the Greeks stand in closest connection with a number of Italian races, especially the Latins, Umbrians, and Oscans. More distantly related are the rest of the Indo-European peoples—Celts, Germans, Slavs, as well as Armenians and Iranians. Thus it is probable that of the above-mentioned peoples the Italians lived longest with the Greeks, and were the last to separate from them. We are able to come to this conclusion because we know these Italian languages more or less satisfactorily. But if we endeavour to reconstruct early Greek history with the aid of philology, a great gap in our knowledge immediately makes itself felt. We know very little of the languages of the southern group of Italian peoples, of the races of the northern half of the Balkan peninsula, and

of Asia Minor, and these are unfortunately the languages of the very peoples who in later times came into the most direct contact with the Greeks, and with whom they must have remained united for a long time, perhaps longer than any others. We are unable to say with certainty how close was the connection of the Greeks with the Phrygians, the Thracians, the Illyrians, and the Messapians, nor do we know in what order the separation of the Greeks from these and other kindred races took place. For example, were the Phrygians the first to leave the parent stem, then the Thracians, then the Illyrians, and finally the Messapians? Was there ever a period when, after the separation of all these peoples, the Greeks and Italians lived together as so-called Italograeci? We cannot say. The known Indo-European languages may be compared to a colour-scale, in which the transitional shades and one or more of the principal colours besides are wanting. The difficulty of arranging them in their proper order is obvious. If we could tell, for instance, which were the intermediate colours between the Iranian and the Greek, we should know more of the origin of the latter. To use another comparison, the known Indo-European languages are like the branches of a tree of which many other branches are unknown to us. Hence we cannot say in what relation even the known ones stand to each other and to the rest. We do not know at what part of the trunk or from what bough the branch, which we call the Greek people, was detached. Thus very little can be said in answer to the first and second questions. We assume a series of kindred peoples, extending from Phrygia to Sicily: Phrygians, Trojans, Thracians, Macedonians, Illyrians, Epirotes, Greeks, Italians, Messapians, Chaonians, Oenotrians, Sicels, Sicanians. The Greeks were a branch of this family tree. It is possible that the home of these kindred peoples, as many writers contend with good reason, was not originally in the interior of Asia, but in Europe. This, however, does not make it impossible for the Greeks to have come into

Greece partly from Asia Minor. Everything rather tends to prove that the Greeks entered their country from two sides, from the north of the Balkan peninsula southwards, and from Asia Minor across the Aegean Sea westwards. If Europe was the original home of the Greeks, they must have separated in Thrace to meet again in Hellas.

Now to answer the third question. What degree of civilization had the Greeks reached when they first settled in Greece? Philology proves that they were by no means a rude people. If the Greeks say *ἀρόω* and *ἄροτρον*, the Romans *aro* and *aratrum* for "to plough" and "a plough," it is clear that they were both acquainted with agriculture before they separated. This agriculture would naturally not be particularly advanced, and so it is well that a protest has recently been made against exaggerated statements as to the high development of the earliest Greek civilization.[4] And no one will deny that they must have possessed a certain amount of knowledge of the science and practice of agriculture. But they were not always on the move. They tarried here and there, and naturally sowed fruit seeds and millet and barley. The earliest inhabitants of Thera were acquainted with agriculture, as the remains show. The cultivation of the vine is another matter. If they carried grain with them on their travels, it does not follow that they took vine-shoots as well, which require more than a short summer to grow up and bear fruit, and besides wine is not, like bread, a necessary of life. There is therefore no necessity for the assumption that those Greeks, with whom we are now specially dealing, brought the vine with them when they settled in Greece; indeed it is more likely, when we consider the myths concerning the arrival of Dionysus, that at first they did without wine. At the same time it may very well have been known to the earliest Greeks. Cattle-breeding provided the means of subsistence even more than agriculture. However different the surface of the soil might be in particular parts, life in the various cantons of

Greece must, roughly speaking, have had much the same aspect. In the valleys corn was sown and cattle pastured. Bees supplied wax and honey, and wild trees sour fruit. The best meat was procured by the chase, while the products of the animal kingdom served a variety of purposes, such as clothing, vessels for eating and drinking, and bowstrings. Boats were covered with leather, and draught cattle were harnessed with leather thongs. From the wool of sheep was made the felt used for a head-covering (Greek πῖλος, Latin *pileus*). Cloth was manufactured from bark and the fibres of plants, at first plaited, and afterwards woven; the ordinary pottery was of clay baked in the sun. The weaker members of the tribe were carried on waggons when it was necessary to pass from one place to another. Their dwellings were either natural or artificial caverns, or huts built of wood, wicker-work, mud, or stone. The practice in lake countries of driving piles into the bottom of the lake and building upon them no doubt obtained in Greece; Herodotus relates this custom of the Paonians in Thrace. That the earliest Greeks were acquainted with metals is rendered probable by the word for "copper" being common to Sanskrit, German, and Latin (*ajas, ais, aes*); but as the Greeks happened to have had another word for it (*chalkos*), we may assume that they did not use copper so much as stone implements in the earliest times.

Philology has thrown much light on the religion of the early Greeks. An original connection between the Greek and Indian religions has been demonstrated, thus bringing the origin of Greek mythology into clearer relief. Their mythology proves to be simply the poetic expression of their mode of regarding nature. The variety of mythological imagery, however, arose from the peculiarity of the early language, which on the one hand supplies a number of expressions for the same object, and on the other hand gives the same general name to different objects. The consequence

is that when different words are used for the same thing, that one thing is represented in a variety of ways. In Greek, German, and Indian mythology cow, horse, sheep, and ship all signify cloud. And inversely, just as the same adjective is used with different substantives, so the same symbol can express different objects; for example, horse can stand for cloud, light, sunbeam, spring, or wave. This multiplicity of designations explains the otherwise puzzling fact, that only a few gods bear the same name among kindred peoples. There were so many ways of expressing the same idea, that different races easily adopted different names for the same deity. Yet in spite of this the Greeks had some names of gods in common with kindred races. The name of the chief god Zeus, genitive Dios, corresponds to that of the Indian god of the heavens, Indra, Dyâus, genitive Divás, both signifying the clear sky. And another Greek name for the heavens dates from earliest times, Uranus corresponding to the Sanskrit Varunas, which originally denoted the covering, the all-embracing. Finally Eos, Latin Aurora, corresponds to the Sanskrit Ushas. The conclusion to be drawn is that the Greek belief in the divinity of the sky and its principal manifestations came from their first home and their early association with kindred peoples. The sky as the giver of light was the chief object of their attention and their adoration. But in myths, which deal not with gods and persons moving in the divine sphere, but with beings holding intercourse with mortals, stress is laid on other kinds of celestial phenomena, which also corresponds to what we know of India. The Indians spoke of the Açvins, horsemen, creatures of night and day, who represent the breaking of the dawn, corresponding to the Greek Dioscuri, who are horsemen, and travellers by chariot and ship. The Asuri rob Indra of his herd of cattle and hide them in a mountain where Indra finds them again. The same story often occurs in Greek mythology. Heracles robs Geryones of his cattle in Erytheia, which lies in

the far West. And the newly-born Hermes steals the cattle of Apollo and drags them backwards into a cave. The Asuri and Hermes are storm-gods, the cattle are the clouds. India and Greece both have a drink for the gods, in the former called soma, in the latter nectar or ambrosia. The Gandharvi of India correspond to the Centaurs of Greece. Both are winds which drive the rain clouds before them. Among the Gandharvi too, as among the Centaurs, some are fond of music and some uncivilized. It is not surprising to find lightning the weapon of the God of Heaven among the Indians as well as among the Greeks. As in the case of Prometheus with the Greeks, so with the Indians, a demi-god is said to have stolen fire from the gods, in order to give it to man. The lightning god Hephaestus exists in a two-fold capacity in India, as Agni (*ignis*) and Tvashtar. Just as the deities connected with Hephaestus, the Cyclopes, Telchines, Cabeiri and Dactyli, represent the idea of artistic skill, so do the Ribhus in India. The thunderstorm too is conceived as a battle of the gods with their foes, and similar gigantic enemies of the gods are found both in the Indian and Greek mythologies.

The above instances cannot in every case be proved by special evidence to belong to the most primitive times in Greece, but they bear on their face the appearance of remote antiquity, so that we may consider them as relics of the earliest beliefs of the Greeks. As regards worship there is no doubt that prayer—that is, in the original form of the hymn—dates from the earliest times. Of sacrifice the drink-offering is clearly the oldest, in India the soma, in Greece fermented honey or wine. Animal sacrifice is also admitted. It is clear that in this respect their migrations imposed much constraint and involved many innovations. Hence complete agreement in Greek and Indian forms of worship cannot be expected. Much was forgotten and only recalled by renewed intercourse with the East.[5]

We come to the conclusion that the Greeks on their arrival were a simple people of Aryan origin, but acquainted with agriculture, and in possession of a nature-worship, the object of which was the sky and its phenomena, such as light, lightning, clouds, rain; and that these celestial phenomena and natural forces found expression in myths. By what route the earliest Greeks entered the countries which they afterwards possessed, can only be conjectured; one half probably came into European Greece from the north by land and the other half from the east by water. We must now make ourselves acquainted with the natural aspect of the country, not merely because it is the scene of the events which constitute the history of Greece, but also because it supplies some explanation of the main characteristics of the Greek people. For although the soil does not make a people who come from elsewhere and are not originally natives of it, still it gives a certain bias to character, and knowledge of the country leads to a better comprehension of the history of its people.

NOTES

1. The main question here is whether we ought to consider the Macedonians as Greeks. According to Fick in Kuhn's Zeitschriften xxii., this question is to be answered in the affirmative. For the opposite view see G. Meyer. Cf. Droysen, Alex. d. Gr. I.^{2} 69.

2. The characteristics of the Greek language have been admirably summarised by Curtius, Gr. Gesch. I.^{4} 17. It reveals the identical quality which made the Greek nation great, keeping the golden mean between poverty and redundance, between stiffness and lack of vigour. The study of dialects which has been carried on with so much thoroughness of late, aided as it is by the constantly increasing store of inscriptions, holds out promise of considerable advance in our knowledge of the varied relations of even the early peoples of Greece, as opposed to the present state of this knowledge, which does not justify any general conclusions on the subject.

3. The position in regard to the so-called prehistoric antiquities in Greece is peculiar. The excavations, especially those made by

Schliemann, have disclosed a vast mass of materials, the sifting of which is making rapid progress, and a part of which certainly may be classed as prehistoric. Now, owing to the wealth of Greece in old traditions we are inclined to connect the discoveries made in famous spots with the famous heroes of remote antiquity, and so what would be considered merely prehistoric in other countries is in Greece regarded rather as an illustration of early history known to us from other sources, just as it may happen to strike the eminent man who makes the discovery. In our opinion these discoveries no doubt belong to prehistoric ages, *i.e.* those of which we have no regular written records. At the same time we do not believe that they belong to such early times as are discussed in this chapter, and from this point of view we say: For the primitive history of Greece our only authority of importance up to the present is philology. The discoveries at Thera no doubt form an exception,—because they are the only evidence of a really remote period of history in this island,—and so do the oldest of the objects found at Ilium. The remains of the stone-age discovered in Greece have been discussed by A. Dumont, La Grèce avant la légende et avant l'histoire, Revue Archéologique, T. xvi., and Sp. Lampros in his Μελετήματα Ἀθ. 1884, p. i. seq. O. Schrader, Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte p. 210, takes much the same view as we do of the importance of prehistoric discoveries. To avoid attaching too great importance to them, the great thing is to bear in mind that they must by their very nature always deal with two unknown elements, the people as well as the age to which the articles discovered belong. Hence the discrepancy between the views of distinguished scholars regarding, for instance, the historical importance of the lacustrine dwellings in the valley of the Po.

4. Doubts with respect to the theory of an advanced state of agriculture amongst the early Greeks are raised by V. Hehn, Kulturpflanzen und Hausthiere in ihrem Uebergange von Asien nach Griechenland und Italien, Berlin, 1870, and later editions.

5. For the contents of this chapter cf. especially O. Schrader, Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte, Jena, 1883. Part I. of this excellent work contains a summary of modern investigations in the department of ancient history based on a comparison of languages. In the subsequent parts special questions are discussed (*e.g.* the introduction of metals), and finally primitive ages are depicted in detail. The author treats, as do all philologists, the problems of the history of civilization with a care and circumspection which may serve as a model for purely historical inquiry. According to these researches a Graeco-Italian period, in the sense that the Greeks and Italians formed one whole, to the exclusion of

other races, is no longer probable. Cf. Schrader, p. 314, on the differences in the names for weapons among the Latins and the Greeks, and the similarity of such names in the Greek and Aryan languages. The same writer says (p. 454) that the close connection between the Greeks and Aryans from the point of view of the history of civilization appears in the departments of religion, of agriculture (pp. 182, 359), and of names of weapons, etc. This, in our opinion, is no slight support to our own theory, that the early Greeks did not come into the country only from the north by land, as most writers (among them Schrader, p. 449) suppose, but also from the east across the sea to European Greece. For the religions in the earliest ages the well-known writings of A. Kuhn and Max Müller are of special importance; cf. Schrader, pp. 430–441, whose detailed discussion of the modern literature of the subject relieves us of the necessity of making further quotations.

CHAPTER II

THE COUNTRY

THE following geographical sketch is not concerned merely with the countries strictly included under the name of Greece; for the scene of Greek history is not confined to them. The geographical unity of Greece is formed much more by the sea than by the land. The great rivers of the eastern plains of Europe form the Black Sea (Pontus Euxinus), which, dividing Europe from Asia, communicates with the Mediterranean by the Straits and the Propontis. But the Mediterranean is at first by no means an open sea. It is confined by promontories and peninsulas, and studded with islands. These shores, promontories, and islands were the scene of Greek history, and are Greek soil. The latter may be divided into three parts: the Asiatic coast, the Islands, and European Greece. The first part fringes the slopes of the plateau of Asia Minor, which, in the interior, has a thoroughly continental character, similar to that of Irania, but breaks up near the sea into mountains and valleys, promontories and bays. As the mountain chains are nearer the south coast, the general slope of the country is to the north and west, in which direction the great rivers flow. The irregularity of the coast is most marked in the west, and this is where Greek territory begins. Here we find numerous rivers separated by mountain chains which run in the same direction and are continued in the adjacent islands. The

rivers empty themselves into the sea near the further end of the bays, which penetrate so far into the land that a coast-line of great variety is formed. The largest of these, reckoning from north to south, are the Hermus, the Cayster, and the Maeander. The land north of the Hermus is continued in the island of Lesbos, that between the Hermus and the Cayster in the island of Chios, and that between the Cayster and the Maeander across the promontory of Mycale, in the island of Samos. Southwards of the Maeander the coast partakes of the character of the southern shores of Asia Minor. There are deep bays surrounded by mountain chains, and no rivers of sufficient importance to form a flat coast-line. Here we find numerous islands, of which Cos and Rhodes are the most important. After the rounded coast of Lycia in the south-west comes the extensive Gulf of Pamphylia, and here Greek territory ceases.

If we now cross to the European side of the Aegean Sea, to which we may link most of the islands, as they are natural continuations of the mountains of the continent, we find a chain of islands leading across, in the south, Carpathos, Casos, the long line of Crete, and Cythera, and in the north, a line of coast and islands which divide the Aegean Sea from a smaller one, the Thracian Sea. In Asia we find first a broad projection which attains its highest point in Mount Ida, and is faced by the island of Tenedos. The Thracian Chersonese, the long peninsula which runs along the Hellespont, and is connected only by a narrow isthmus with Thrace, belongs to the same system. It is continued, leaving its geological character out of the question, in the islands of Imbros and Lemnos. In Europe the Thracian coast comes next, connected with the interior by great rivers, the Hebrus, Nestus, and Strymon, between the mouths of which only the islands of Samothrace and Thasos break the monotony of the ocean. The northern mainland is traversed from east to west by the mountain chain of the Haemus or Balkans, which

detaches spurs southwards, at first of slight elevation but afterwards rising into Chalcidice, with its varied outline and three promontories; while beyond the Thermaic Gulf, which washes well-watered Macedonia, it presents a gigantic ridge, the ramifications of which form the framework of the country which is specially called Greece. Under the name of Pindus it runs in a southerly direction, at first separating Illyria on the west from Macedonia on the east, and then Epirus from Thessaly. On the western side, towards the Adriatic, there are several parallel chains, with narrows valleys between them; to the east, in the direction of the Aegean Sea, there are at intervals tranverse ridges thrust from west to east seawards, which, joined by other chains running from north to south near the sea, form the boundaries of large countries, first Macedonia and then Thessaly. The latter is a basin enclosed on the east by Olympus, Ossa, and Pelion, and on the south by Othrys, the waters from which have only one exit, the mouth of the Peneius. A peculiar formation lies to the south of Thessaly. The main ridge of Pindus, which has already trended somewhat to the eastward, continues in this direction over Oeta to Parnassus, then breaks into a number of detached mountain groups, and finally forms Attica. The eastern edge of Thessaly is prolonged in the island of Euboea, and afterwards in smaller islands, of which Andros is the nearest. We now find the sea penetrating in all directions, and while Thessaly retains its character of an inland country, the districts round the Euripus which come next, on the one side Euboea, on the other Locris, Phocis, Boeotia, and Attica, are separated by the sea; lastly, only islands remain, the Cyclades, in the west Ceos, Cythnos, Seriphos, Siphnos, a prolongation of Attica; in the east Andros, Tenos, Myconos, Naxos, Amorgos, a continuation of Euboea; in the centre the connecting links of Gyaros, Syros, Paros, Ios, and Anaphe, the two last of which join two islands of volcanic origin in the west, Melos and Thera.

Westward of Oeta and Parnassus are districts which more resemble Epirus in character, Acarnania, Aetolia, and the land of the Ozolian Locrians. Opposite to them, south of the Corinthian Gulf, rises one of the leading divisions of Greece, the Peloponnese, the island of Pelops, and really much resembling an island. It has an independent mountain system, a central group pushing out spurs in a south-easterly direction, and in no way connected with the mountains of Boeotia and Attica. The Peloponnese is rather the lofty termination of the chains which appear here and there to the west of Pindus and parallel to it, and form the Acroceraunian mountains in Epirus, and the Panaetolican and Aracynthian ranges in Aetolia. The great mass of the mountains of the Peloponnese is the group near the northern coast between Achaia and Arcadia, from which spurs run towards the south. Of the latter system the most prominent chain is in the east between Arcadia and Argolis, and from there the Parnon range is continued near Laconia to the promontory of Malea. The inland rivers find no passage through this range to the coast; on the other hand, the western boundary of Arcadia is pierced by the Alpheius, which drains a great part of the Arcadian streams and runs into the Sicilian Sea through Elis. But it only drains western Arcadia; eastern Arcadia has a series of enclosed basins partly provided with subterranean outlets, which are separated from the valley of the Alpheius by a mountain chain, of which the huge Taygetus, dividing Laconia from Messenia, and running into the sea in the promontory of Taenarum, may be considered a continuation. The most important rivers of the Peloponnese flow westwards and southwards, just as in Epirus, Acarnania, and Aetolia. The Ionic islands of Corcyra, Leucas, Cephallenia, and Zacynthus, also run from north-west to south-east close to northern Greece and the Peloponnese. Cythera is a continuation of Parnon.

This, then, is Greece proper: the countries round the

Aegean Sea, with undefined boundaries where they adjoin large continents such as Asia Minor and Thrace, but more strongly defined where no foreign continental peoples can encroach upon them, especially on both sides of the Euripus, and on both sides of the Gulf of Corinth and the Saronic Gulf, which is a continuation of the Gulf of Corinth. The citadel of the Greeks is the Peloponnese, a gigantic island, rather larger than Würtemberg or Wales, and about a quarter smaller than Sicily, with an advantageous coast-line, a continental interior, and long peninsulas. From the large area formed by the Aegean and Thracian littoral, we must subtract a smaller one, the boundaries of which, in the south, east, and west, are identical with those of the larger one, but in the north run from Olympus across Mount Athos to Lemnos, thus excluding the Thracian Sea. What took place within these boundaries is thoroughly Greek.

The climate of Greece is conditioned by its degree of latitude, the proximity of the sea, its position in the eastern half of the Mediterranean, and by the above-mentioned opening of that sea towards the north-east. In the south the latitude favours the cultivation of many things which require great warmth. The exposure, however, of the whole country to the north-east and to the steppes round the Black Sea causes a considerable decrease of temperature, which is sometimes very marked in winter; but the sea air, which penetrates everywhere, tempers this severity. All these influences combine to produce varieties of vegetation, differing even from the products of the same latitudes in Italy, which possesses on the whole a more southern climate. The olive does not thrive till you reach Phthiotis; oranges and lemons, which were unknown to the ancient Greeks, not till you come to the coast of Argolis. In Italy it is not necessary to go so far south to find the same products. Bari, which is famous for its oil, lies two degrees north of Phthiotis, while the oranges of Sorrento grow three degrees north of Argos. Laconia and above all

Messenia are the only districts which have a really southern climate. The celebrated date-palms of Greece serve only as an ornament of the landscape, not for food or profit. But although those fruits which we consider characteristic of southern climes do not flourish abundantly in Greece, yet the soil is rich in useful products of a mild climate, especially in the gifts of Demeter, Dionysus, and Athene, of the two last in a marked degree. In the fair season—that is, with the exception of the short winter—the winds are tolerably regular, often refreshing northerly breezes by day and mild southerly ones by night. The sea routes are safe. The soil is of great variety. It is chiefly composed of limestone ranges, which, in places where the limestone comes to the surface, readily absorb moisture, so that aridity predominates in the peninsulas and islands, and on the mountains; in the valleys and basins, on the other hand, the soil is heavier, and water often stagnates. On the whole, Greece was not a country where the cultivator was richly rewarded without great trouble. In the case of corn, the most important crop of all, the soil was subject to atmospheric influences of varied kinds, and severe labour was necessary. The supply of corn was then, as now, not sufficient for the demand. Hence hard work was the lot of the Greeks, and they were forced to make good their deficiencies by maritime trade.

The climate and configuration of Greece have thus materially contributed to impress a special character on a people allied to the Indian, Persian, Italian, and Germanic races. The overpowering aspect of nature in India, with its luxurious vegetation, its enormous rivers and imposing mountains, was bound to give a peculiar stamp to the religion of the people; the excessive could not help being its dominant note. In Irania nature is swayed by the contrast between the fertility of the inhabited districts and the sterility of the desert, which encroaches on all sides; the corresponding contrast in religion is that between the good and the bad prin-

ciple, nowhere else so sharply drawn. The case is quite different in Greece. It has many features in common with Italy, no overpowering natural forces, and no violent contrasts; on the other hand, the division of the country into cantons leaves room for the development of the peculiarities of small races. But the natural characteristics of Italy and Greece also differ in many respects. Italy has a long coast-line with few bays and harbours, but has much fertile soil. The Italians became for the most part a nation of agriculturists. The Greeks were forced by the configuration and nature of their country to take to the sea, and consequently to pursue what was new. The Italians were, on the whole, conservative. Among the Greeks, only those who had little to do with the sea clung to ancient custom.

NOTES

NEUMANN, Physical Geography of Greece, with special reference to antiquity, publ. by J. Partsch, Bresl. 1885; O. BURSIAN, Geographie von Griechenland, Lpz. 1862-72, 2 Bde.; H. KIEPERT, Lehrbuch der alten Geographie, Berl. 1878, specially Part IX. p. 229, seq.; E. CURTIUS, Peloponnesos, Gotha, 1851-52, 2 Bde. Of maps, esp. H. KIEPERT, Modern Atlas of Hellas and the Hellenic Colonies, 15 maps, Berl. 1872. Of special maps, Map of Attica, prepared by order of the Imp. German Archaeological Institute, and edited by Curtius and Kaupert, Berlin, 1881, seq.; the plans of Olympia, Mycenae, and Pergamus, and the maps published in Vienna for the Austrian archaeological researches in Samothrace and Lycia. Kiepert's special atlas of Western Asia Minor, Berl. 1890, 15 maps, is of great importance. Of old and modern travels the following are very useful:—Dodwell, Gill, Leake (Morea, Lond. 1833; Northern Greece, 1846; Peloponnesiaca, 1846), Ross, Ulrichs, W. Vischer, Erinnerungen und Eindrücke aus Griechenland, 1857; and K. Baedeker, Greece, Handbook for Travellers, Lpz. 1883, the text of which was mostly written by Lolling; also Hanson, The Land of Greece, Lond. 1886.

CHAPTER III

UNCERTAINTIES OF EARLY GREEK HISTORY AND ATTEMPTS TO REMOVE THEM

We have attempted to determine the position of the Greeks among their kindred races, and the degree of civilization to which they had attained at the time of their migration into Greece; we have made ourselves acquainted with the nature of the country, and its influence upon the immigrant race. These are preparations for the history of the Greeks; but we are confronted at the threshold by insurmountable difficulties. We should like to know what happened to the Greeks after they came into Greece; but for a long period we can ascertain nothing of their history.

It is generally admitted that the beginning of Greek history is veiled in obscurity; but many writers believe that certain important facts of a somewhat special nature can be ascertained. The most popular modern work on Greek history contains a more or less detailed account of events in Greece before the Dorian migration. The authorities for it are the hero-myths of the Greeks and certain later traditions, to which a scientific value is ascribed. A short survey of these alleged historical events is given in the next chapter. But we raise the preliminary question: is this method justifiable?

All historical knowledge rests upon contemporary evidence. Before the use of writing in Greece, however, which we cannot assign to a date much earlier than B.C. 800, events, how-

ever important they may be, are handed down to posterity only by oral tradition. That this oral tradition must misstate facts, and that this misstatement must increase with time, is obvious. The earliest events in Greece, according to the myths, occurred before 1500 B.C.; but it is inherently improbable that anything was known about them seven hundred years later. It is true that poetry is a good aid to the memory, that it is well adapted for preserving a correct record, and that it has performed this service in Greece, but it is no help to the history of primitive ages either in the case of Greece or elsewhere. Not because it is indifferent to truth, as one often hears said; for poetry, and especially the oldest poetry, seeks truth, but it is truth of a special kind, the truth as known to the people, for whom the word has only an ethical meaning. The people look to the general sense of a statement and its object; the details are of no importance in their eyes. They may be related in different ways, without impairing the truth as conceived by the people. The people have no conception of the nature of real accuracy in facts; and yet in this very point lies the possibility of history. Thus it is with early narrative poetry. When poets related important events to a people that was still in its infancy, they wished to represent them as they appeared at the moment, and selected details suited to the occasion; this was the truth in their eyes. And another point must be noticed. The primitive man has not only a different conception of the truth from that of the civilized man, but he differs from him also in his idea of what is important. We classify history according to the rules of science; and so we want to know the names of the leaders of the people, how long they ruled, what were the popular rights, and what the privileges of the kings, and many other things of the same kind. This, to a certain extent, interests the primitive man in daily life, but not sufficiently to induce him to hand it down to posterity, and in some respects it does not interest him at all. He considers

other matters of importance, the exploits of mighty warriors, how the gods helped them, their descent and the mode of their death. And if a part of all this assumed the form of poetry it was clothed in a language which still retained remnants of a mythological mode of expression, so that the words did not always mean what we understand by them. Therefore, when the earliest Greeks endeavoured to fix the recollection of events in verse, they had no idea of historical truth in our sense of the words; they attached importance to matters quite different from those which we think worthy of it, and used a mode of expression which did not always have the meaning which we ascribe to it. Lastly, we no longer possess the ancient poems which are nearer in point of date to the events in question. Homer is not much earlier than 800 B.C.

It is also questionable whether these poems really contain the traditions and recollections of the past which we have to consider as the basis of the earliest Greek history. Unqualified acceptance of this view is so little the fashion now-a-days that an attempt has even been made to prove that the contents of the Homeric Epics are mainly arbitrary productions of individual imagination.[1] A poet, it is said, composed a beautiful story, others embellished it, and hence arose legendary history. As a general rule this must be a wrong view of things. The poet was, no doubt, unfettered in the invention of detail, and for this reason, that the people considered that to be true which agreed with the leading facts of history; but a nucleus of tradition must have existed. The interest excited by the deeds of the heroes warrants the assumption that something of the kind must have really taken place and have been recorded. Practically, however, this limitation of the theory of the invention of epic material comes to the same thing as its unqualified acceptance. Although we may be convinced that everything cannot have been invented, yet it does not follow that we know what was invented and what handed down by tradition.

But, it is urged, there does exist a connected historical account of the earliest times of Greece. How could this have arisen on the above supposition? How could tradition, so to speak, be created out of nothing? The following observations will show how this is possible.

The connected literary documents which we possess are not older than the fifth century B.C. (Herodotus), the fragmentary writings not earlier than the end of the sixth century B.C. (some logographers). From what sources do these historians derive their accounts of antiquity? Firstly from poems and then from oral tradition. The primary source is the Homeric poems, which gave a brilliant account of two particular events of heroic times. To these was attached the Epic Cycle, a methodical and exhaustive account of all the legends connected with the Trojan war. Other poets narrated other legends. The interest in the remarkable events of the heroic ages decided the character of the composition. But another and a more practical school of poets arose. It had been customary for distinguished families to trace their descent from famous heroes of antiquity and the gods of the nation. The next step was to compose a regular history of the ancestors of these families. This task was undertaken by the Hesiodic School in the Catalogue of Women, the Eoeae and similar works. It was all spurious history, invented matter dressed up in the form of a narrative of successive events.[2]

This was the material used by the logographers when in the sixth century they continued the work of the poets. They wrote in prose and their object was rather to instruct than to entertain. It was more in the nature of real history, because they mostly used written authorities and refrained as a matter of principle from inventing facts. But history requires stricter chronology than poetry, which serves only for amusement. To establish the chronology it was only necessary to work on the lines of the Hesiodic School. The series of generations formed the framework of the narrative, and then

the guiding principle of arrangement was to make the personages contemporary with one another. This method had been already indicated in the poems. For the heroes hardly ever confined their actions to their native district. They come in contact with each other in a friendly or hostile manner; they unite for an enterprise, or fight one another. When once a place has been the scene of a battle or of some common exploit of old times, the local heroes never remain alone, but in course of time other comrades are constantly added to the principal personages. Hence arose a synchronism of heroic times, a succession of generations which formed the standard for the whole of Greece. This was already the case with the poets, but their work was marked by variations and contradictions. The logographers treated the works of the poets as scientific matter, reconciled conflicting passages, struck out others, and added whatever seemed necessary to remove contradictions and ensure probability. The period over which their legendary histories extend can even now be proved to be the result of a deliberate combination founded on the assumption of the truth of these legends.

Among these legendary heroes and exploits, two stand forth as the real centres round which all the others are grouped: Heracles and the Trojan war. The two centres are quite distinct. What gravitates to the one has no relation to the other. The comrades of Heracles are not comrades of Agamemnon. But it was clear that Heracles must be earlier than the heroes of the Trojan war, for Heracles was more powerful and more like the gods. That makes two generations. To the Trojan legend belonged from of old the fortunes of the children of the heroes who fought before Troy. Here we have a third generation. With Heracles the method is reversed and the scale is an ascending one. For in this case we have to deal with the actions of one person and it was important to know his descent. He had a mortal mother who was descended from a mortal father. This makes two

more generations. And now we come to a very ancient hero, almost as celebrated as Heracles, named Perseus. Perseus never came in contact with Heracles, on the contrary it was found expedient to represent Heracles as descended from him, but he was not the father nor the grandfather of Heracles, for these appear in the Heraclean legend. Hence he had to be his great-grandfather, and his place in chronology was fixed. With a mortal for his mother and her royal father the two further requisite generations are provided. In this way we get the eight necessary generations represented by Acrisius, Danae, Perseus, Electryon, Alcmene, Heracles, Agamemnon, and Orestes. That only the most necessary generations were taken we see from the fact that none was interposed between Heracles and Agamemnon, and that this interposition was unnecessary arises from the fact that the two cycles of legend are quite distinct. The Heraclidae themselves have nothing whatever to do with the Trojan war; we have here a survival of the original isolation of the two legends. The manufacture of a connection between the legends, which was originally foreign to them, has therefore produced a chronology expressed at first by generations and afterwards by years, viz., eight generations between Acrisius and Orestes, which amount to about 240 years, and as a matter of fact are placed from about 1380 to 1150 B.C. Before them mere names are given, and after them also, up to more historical times. We need not refer to the earlier names here. The invention of those which come after Orestes and Telemachus is easily explained. For a transition period was needed between the time when there were men who were themselves sons of gods, and that in which the gods no longer had intercourse with mortals; for this purpose a series of names sufficed.[3]

We have thus seen that the narratives of events in Greece before the Dorian migration have no historical value, and that we can prove the genesis of the chronological table which learned men of later times, Alexandrians and others, vied

with each other in correcting. It is no use saying that if there is no proof of the accuracy of any one fact in the earliest history of Greece, at all events every detail cannot be proved to be untrue, and that therefore there may be a good deal of truth in what is ascribed to Agamemnon. Here analogy steps in, which at all events can serve as a warning. It has been cleverly used by Grote. The appearance of Charles the Great in heroic poems is no reason for doubting his existence. But any one who tried to compose the history of Charles from the Carolingian cycle would probably find little that was accurate; and if poems were the only source of our knowledge of him we should hardly know whether he had really lived.[4]

But enough of persons. There remain the tribes with their histories, which appear specially in their migrations, which must have been very frequent in early times. Can nothing be ascertained about these tribes, whose history is more important than the fortunes of individuals? Not from direct notices in ancient writers, for they only reproduce legend. If Aetolus is the son of a king of Elis, we cannot take that as proof that the Aetolians once migrated from Elis; for this story may have been invented in order to justify the Aetolian occupation of Elis at the time of the Dorian migration. Migrations of tribes must be determined in another manner. A method has been followed here which has met with great approval and is most ingeniously thought out. Starting from the correct assumption that some of the principal worships of the Greeks could originally only have belonged to certain tribes, Ottfried Müller has endeavoured to ascertain the migration and expansion of the various races by the extension and propagation of these worships. This would be, if it were possible, determining one fact by another. Müller has made the experiment especially in the case of the Dorians, and has taken the worship of Apollo as a starting-point. Others have followed in his footsteps.[5]

The safety, however, of this method is not remarkable

even from a theoretical point of view. Identity of worship did not always exist where it was asserted. Priests have often, in order to enhance the renown of their shrine, claimed for it an importance and assigned to it an antiquity which it did not possess. Often the relationship claimed was not old, and in those cases it proves nothing as to the early movements of the race. Even if it was old, it would not confirm the migrations of whole races, for the worship of a deity might be spread by the priests alone.[6] Finally, in order to argue from the spread of worships to migrations of races it must be clearly established what forms of worship were originally peculiar to certain races. But even this cannot be done. Race and worship are by no means convertible terms for us, and so the practical application of this brilliant hypothesis falls to the ground.[7]

These are the theoretical objections to the method. They may however be exaggerated; but the evidence of results would remove all doubt. But do the chief representatives of this school agree as to these results? O. Müller's main conclusions, drawn from his study of the wanderings of Apollo, are as follows. The first period of the extension of Apollo-worship embraces the earliest wanderings of the Dorian race, from Tempe to Delphi, Cnossus in Crete, and Delos. The second includes the naval ascendency of Minos, who covers the coasts of Asia with sacred groves and expiatory altars dedicated to the god. The third is that of the Dorian migration, during which the Peloponnese was occupied.[8] How does this view agree with that of the present day, of which E. Curtius, the pupil of O. Müller, is the exponent? The worship of Apollo, says Curtius, did not originate with the Dorians, but was communicated to them by other Greeks; it had its rise in the east and upon the sea-coast; the Dorians did not inhabit Crete before their migration, and Minos is not a Dorian. A wider discrepancy cannot be imagined. The direction of the migrations is almost completely reversed.

Can contrary conclusions be drawn by the same method from the same facts? The truth is that history cannot attain the accuracy of natural sciences. The view we take of particular historical facts depends in a marked degree, especially in the case of earliest times, on our general conception of a period. This conception differs entirely in the case of Müller and Curtius. The former considers Greek civilization to be of purely native origin; the latter holds it to be the product of Eastern influences working upon a native nucleus. According to Müller, Apollo journeys from Europe to Asia, according to Curtius, from Asia to Europe. And the two scholars derive their theories in part from the results of inquiry in other branches of knowledge. The revival of the study of Greek antiquity encouraged Müller's view, while that of Curtius is a consequence of the opening up of the East.[9]

The view has been expressed that primitive Greek history may be treated by the same method as that adopted by geologists in investigating the rocks. It is a fact that layers of peoples have covered other layers. Are there not here, it is said, as in geology, characteristic shells to guide us? Forms of divine worship would be such. Unfortunately the present state of our knowledge of antiquity makes this an illusion. Theoretically it is of course true that every new stratum of people brought with it its particular form of worship. We can however no longer recognize it, because it is so blended with older forms, and our defective knowledge of antiquity does not enable us to distinguish what has remained unchanged from what has been altered. And only the former is of value for our purpose. Forms of worship which we know only partially through the meagre and disconnected references of later times are not like shells which lie as smooth and clean after the lapse of thousands of years as on the day that the waters covered them, and in the same stratum where they were buried. The light thrown upon the migrations of Greek races by the method of statistics and analysis of forms of worship

has a larger element of subjectivity than is desirable in history.

But in truth every history is subjective which has any life in it and is not a mere collection of names, and the history of remote ages is the most subjective of all. The reader even demands subjectivity because he demands life. But he will also feel grateful to those who say: this little we do know, beyond it begins the region of possibility.[10]

NOTES

1. The nucleus of fact contained in the myths has been reduced to a minimum by BENED. NIESE in his Entwickelung der Homerischen Poesie, Berl. 1882. The real point of this ingenious book lies in its application to Greek history. There is no disputing that poetry, in its epical form, has embellished the psychological side of the legends in a one-sided and arbitrary fashion by the invention of persons and situations, and Niese's theory can with certain limitations be turned to good account. But even as a matter of theory we must not persist too far in mere negation. If, *e.g.* we did not know the exact situation of Oechalia, which is mentioned in the legends of Heracles, this would show that a tradition was in existence which had gradually spread, not that it was an invention of some particular poet, for he would certainly have referred to a definite locality. Niese's main conclusions respecting the genesis of historiography among the Greeks seem to me, as I have said elsewhere, perfectly correct.

2. The beginnings of the history of the past proceed from noble families who desire to enhance their distinction by the glory of their past; the beginnings of the annals of the present proceed from energetic princes who wish to hand down a record of their exploits to posterity. That the latter aim at truth just as little as the former is shown by Egyptian records, and may be conjectured in the case of Babylonia. On the Epic Cycle cf. von WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF'S Homerische Untersuchungen, Berl. 1884. Of local Epic poets the best known are Asius of Samos and Eumelus of Corinth (eighth cent.); Pisander wrote a Heracleia. Stesichorus (about 600) was an epic poet who used the lyrical form. In the sixth century the logographers begin, so called from an arbitrary interpretation of the words of Thucydides (I. 21). Cf. CREUZER, Histor. Kunst der Griechen, 1803 (and 1845); A. SCHÄFER'S Quellenkunde, Pt. I.; and MÜLLER'S Fragmenta Hist. Gr., esp. Bd. I.

3. Our treatment of the origin of legendary history also shows the mistake of believing that mythical synchronism is of some use for scientific chronology. If the heroes are fantastic creations of popular imagination and of individual poets, if the relations in which they stand to one another are nearly all arbitrary invention, no probable conclusions can be drawn as to the duration of the real history which may underlie these myths. They may have lived, if they did exist, within the space of a single century ; or they may have extended over five or six hundred years. To take the arbitrary period of 240 years of the alleged heroic age as the real duration of a genuine epoch in Greek history, and then to see what chronological coincidences with Egyptian and Phoenician history can be discovered on this basis, is not a sound method. Chronology cannot be constructed on a foundation of legend.

4. We must not confuse two things here. Criticism has proved that we have no guarantee of the correctness of any single detail of Greek mythical history, and that most of it, especially the juxtaposition of purely local heroes, is invention. Of course this does not prevent gifted scholars from making conjectures as to the true character of individuals or incidents by the aid of monuments, traditions of another kind, or characteristic features of the legends themselves. This has been done in modern days. Such opinions may be shared, but are not susceptible of real proof.

5. The statistics of worships have been very cleverly used for the municipal history of Athens by C. Wachsmuth, Die Stadt Athen, Lpz. 1874 ; see esp. p. 386.

6. This is a point which O. Müller himself has acknowledged, Dor. I. 250 ; it is generally now passed over in silence. Cf. also the note on Tempe and Delphi.

7. Every important god has been considered by modern investigators as the primitive god of almost every race in turn. Cf. the attempts of E. Gerhard, Ueber Griechenlands Volkstämme und Stammgottheiten, Berl. Akad. 1853 ; of H. D. Müller, Geschichte der Griechischen Stämme ; of Chr. Petersen in his learned but little noticed Griech. Mythologie (Ersch and Gruber, 1 Bd. 82). Petersen refers the various epochs of Greek religion to the advance of the races in the following manner. After the Indo-European and Italo-Greek periods comes the Aeolian, with Zeus, Hera, Athene, the Peleidae in Dodona, and the Sibyls ; then the Graeco-Ionic, with Apollo, Artemis, Poseidon, the legends of Prometheus and Theseus ; finally the Achaean, which produces the legends of the Aeacidae, the Pelopidae, and the Trojan war. Other epochs are given by Stark—Ep. d. gr. Religiongesch. Verh. d. Philologenvers. 1863. How different the results of different investigators

are is shown in the case of Apollo, who, according to O. Müller, is Dorian, according to Gerhard, Achaean, according to Petersen and others, Ionian ; and of Poseidon, who is mixed up with the legends of the Ionians (Aegeus) and of the Aeolids (Arne, Boeotus). Is he an Aeolian or Ionian god ? A clue is followed which leads to satisfactory results ; other clues lead to entirely different but quite as satisfactory conclusions. Finally, the threads cross, and you do not know if you have the same one in your hands as at the start.

8. Müller, Dor. I. 250.

9. This method gets over the difficulty of diametrically opposite results as follows : migration of worship proves migration of race, but the direction may be the exact opposite of that recorded by tradition, as this confusion of starting-point and goal is of frequent occurrence. And this is undeniable. But then we have Delphi and Tempe, and Ionic-Asiatic shrines of Apollo, which were priestly rather than popular colonies, brought into contact with each other, according to Curtius (I.[4] 499), originally by Dorians who discovered them in their migrations. This, too, is highly possible. But when we see how the same facts (identity of worship) can be used to produce such different results :—migration of races in one direction and in an entirely opposite direction, sacerdotal colonies, connection of almost identical worships by complete strangers — are we really justified in saying that the statistics of worships are a serviceable basis for the history of races ? Heroic history may eventually enlighten us more on the subject than the history of the gods, because most of the heroes still preserve more local colouring, but not until literary and historical investigations of the original sources, on the plan recently adopted by Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, have made further progress. The method hitherto accepted of taking one's proof wherever it can be found offers no guarantee of accuracy.

10. The heroic legends, of which those relating to the propagation of worships form a part, are useless for history as we understand it, because in many cases they are invented to further the ambition of individuals or states. Fictions of this kind, the object of which is clear, are, for example, when it was said in antiquity that a hero had taken possession of a country, or received it as a gift, or presented it to others, and that consequently certain peoples or individuals, descended from the hero or from those who received the gift from him, were authorized to claim it for themselves. The most use was made of Heracles in this respect, who was thus able to dispose of the Peloponnese and western Sicily. The Athenians were supposed to claim the territory on the Scamander through Theseus, Aesch. Eum. 397, for Athens possessed Sigeium. These are

legends invented for practical use, and there are many such in the whole body of legend. Cf. also O. GRUPPE in his critique of Studniczka's Cyrene in the Berlin Phil. Woch., 1890, No. 26. The historical school, which endeavours to construct history out of legends, no doubt takes another view. It assumes, for instance, that legends of the movements of a hero must in many cases have their root in the migrations of the race represented by him, or at all events in the tradition that the race really did so migrate. It thus takes for granted that the legends are the clothing of historical truths in certain language, in other words the concentration of the deeds of a nation into one person. Legends thus become historical enigmas, which a clever man may solve. Hence Forchhammer calls them, "Riddles of nature's past." And if this is so, we should be nearer the truth, having regard to the intellectual standpoint of primitive times, and the interests which swayed primitive man, if we saw riddles of nature rather than of history in legend. In this way the close connection between myth and legend would not be severed. But it is better not to see any riddles in legends, but rather the free prolongation of a thread, originally short, the character of which, whether partaking of nature or of human life, cannot always be determined.

CHAPTER IV

EARLIEST TRADITIONAL HISTORY

We must now give an outline of the earliest traditional history of the Greeks, for whatever our final opinion may be as to its accuracy, a knowledge of these traditions, which influence the historical conscience of educated men more than critically established facts, or the assertion that no such facts exist, is part of the knowledge of history itself. We naturally adopt as a basis the latest form of tradition.[1] But this form is only the last link of a chain beginning with the genealogists and logographers, which writers of different ages have developed according to the standard of their scientific education.

The Greeks called themselves Hellenes; but before the Hellenes, and to a certain extent contrasted with them, they placed the Pelasgians. In what relation do the Hellenes stand to the earlier Pelasgians? The modern opinion is that no absolute contrast exists between them, and that the Hellenes were Pelasgians changed by the infusion of new race elements and a different form of civilization. Some inquirers, especially Duncker, consider that the Greek people came to Greece only by land from the north; others, headed by Curtius, assume an influx of allied but long-separated races from Asia by sea. According to Curtius this emigration was brought about by the Phoenicians, and these Asiatic Greeks appear early on the scene under the name of Ionians. By means of these new-comers, who were Greeks but influenced

in their civilization by other Asiatic races, the whole life of the formerly simple people was changed. Their religion was altered. The only native deity was Zeus. The other deities reveal their foreign origin by the fact that their first altars were erected on the shores of the Aegean. The Pelasgians had no polytheism, or only a slight tinge of it, but it was developed by the influence of the Ionians, who, on their side, represented an Asiatic civilization. Direct Phoenician influence is seen in the worship of Aphrodite and of Heracles. But indirectly all the other gods are of Oriental origin, as Poseidon, Dionysus, Artemis, Demeter, and even Athene. Apollo himself comes from across the sea; he is originally the god of Delphi. But this migration of the gods from Asia belongs to a very remote period of Greek history; we are brought somewhat nearer to real historical times by the heroic legends in which the Greek people have represented the events of the period in which the uniformity of Pelasgian life was succeeded by the variety of Hellenism. The civilizing influence of the earliest emigrants from the East is depicted in the history of Heracles, of whom Theseus is a refined copy. Heroic life flourished especially in those countries where Heracles chiefly displayed his activity. In Boeotia the legend of Cadmus shows what Greece owed to the East. In Thessaly the heroic legends cluster round the Pagasaic Gulf from which the Argo started on her voyage. Argos shows how the civilization which comes from the East first struck root on the coast of Greece. The example of the Phoenicians led to piracy among the settlers round the Aegean sea, chief among whom was the mixed race of the Carians. This confusion was put an end to by Minos, king of Crete, who thus appears as the first genuinely historical personage of Greek history. Meanwhile in Asia Minor also considerable kingdoms were being formed: the Phrygian with an Aryan population, the Lydian which was probably Semitic, on the coast the kingdom of Troy, and south of this, on Mount Sipylus, the kingdom of Tantalus. In

the south-west corner of Asia there arose the peculiar Lycian civilization, which achieved success in architecture, and is of importance in the history of religion on account of the worship of Apollo which especially flourished there. Apollo goes from Lycia to Delos and then to Thessaly. In this country, especially round the Pagasaic Gulf, we find the Minyae, the first important sailors among the Greeks, who also migrated southwards and founded Orchomenus in Boeotia as a rival of Thebes. In Thebes many currents meet: Europa reminds us of Sidon, Heracles of Tyre and Amphion, and Zethus of Asia Minor. The Cadmeans are essentially foreigners, while the Aeolidae are native heroes, and, according to Curtius, not so much members of a single race as representatives of a stage in civilization, that of the Pelasgians, who, by their intercourse with foreign Ionians and Leleges, attained a higher degree of culture. The same characteristics belong to the Achaeans, considered by Curtius as a branch of the Aeolians, but distinguished from them by greater historical reality. They were to be found on many coasts, in Cyprus, in Crete, at the mouth of the Peneius, on Pelion, in Aegina, and in Attica. They are not a distinct race, but a collection of prominent families, who in European Greece attained to a more independent development than the earlier Aeolians. To the Achaeans belong the legends of Achilles and Pelops. Among them we find tumuli which were erected in honour of the dead, as in Lydia. In Thessaly it is probable that there was a union of a foreign royal race and a native population; from there a branch went off to Argos. Argos, however, was not without civilization; Danaos had already been there, having come, as it was said, from Rhodes. The Danaids remained in close relationship with the East; Lycian Cyclopes built Tiryns, Perseus came from Lycia. In the course of a feud in the house of the Danaids, the Aeolidae rose to greater power, especially Adrastus, who wished to destroy the hated city of Cadmus. But at this point the Tantalidae, who knew how to win the favour of the

people, acquired the supremacy. The Lycians are conquered by Lydians in Argolis, and thus arises the power of the Pelopidae. The power of the Achaeans in the Peloponnese was originally of a continental nature, but they established also a naval supremacy, and thus came into hostile relations with Troy. As we know that Ilium, Thebes, Orchomenus, Tiryns, and Mycenae existed, we are bound to admit the existence of Dardan, Minyan, Cadmean, and Argive princes, and in this sense Agamemnon and Priam are historical personages. All these principalities owe their existence to the supremacy of the Asiatic Greeks; it is the period of transition from the Pelasgians to Hellenism.

At this point begins a reaction on the part of the European elements, concerning which we have no longer to trust so completely to tradition. Suffice it to say that according to Curtius the Dorians commenced their historical career on Olympus under King Aegimius and under the influence of the Apollo of Tempe. Here they had kings who claimed to be Heraclidae. Possessing a high order of civilization at the time when they were forced southwards, they made use of it to unite the peoples by which they were then surrounded. This was accomplished by means of the Amphictyones. The Dorians found the worship of Apollo again in Delphi, which was known to them in Tempe, and brought the two sanctuaries into connection with each other. From the Amphictyonic league founded by the Dorians arises the conception and name of Hellenes.

NOTE

1. The most recent scientific revision of the traditionary epoch is that by E. Curtius, whose work is constantly gaining in popularity, as is shown by the English, French, and Italian translations of it. We have had, therefore, in this short summary of tradition, to rely mainly on Curtius. Duncker passes over tradition in silence. It appeared to me necessary to give an account of it and at the same time maintain my own point of view.

CHAPTER V

CRITICISM OF THIS TRADITIONAL HISTORY, ESPECIALLY OF THAT FOUNDED ON LEGEND

How far, then, can we consider all this to be historical? According to what we have said in Chapter IV. the existence of traditional personages, their fortunes, and their relations to one another cannot be looked upon as proved. Of course the greater or less probability or improbability of details can be demonstrated by careful examination. We cannot enter into an exhaustive examination of this kind here. We must confine ourselves to examples, which will show even in detail that the imaginative license of the poets and logographers preponderates so much that they cannot be considered as authorities for history.

Let us take first the legends about Argolis. The most important town in this district is Mycenae. Here tradition clearly refers to two ruling families, the Perseidae and the Pelopidae, of whom by far the most famous personage was the Pelopid Agamemnon. But even his father's name is not settled with certainty and unanimity. And yet knowledge is claimed of the events of those troublous times when the sovereignty is said to have passed from one house to the other.[1] There was nothing to prevent a poet from inventing this, and the logographers then copied it into prose. The manufacture of history is still more evident in the legends of the town of Argos,[2] which, although as a rule not completely incor-

porated into history, have exercised considerable influence on it. Argos was bent on having an unbroken succession of rulers, but at what a cost! After Inachus, whose name represents the river of the country, comes a series of names, which are partly those of towns or peoples, such as Aegialeus, Pelasgus, Epidaurus, Argos (those who inserted them wished to prove that the people of Aegialeia and Epidaurus and all the Pelasgians came from Argos), and partly selected in a singular fashion, such as Iasus, who personifies a Homeric epithet.[3] Then comes the famous Io, as to whose descent the most learned persons do not agree. One sees how anxious they were to press the great isolated figures of legend into their historical system. Danaus is descended from Io. The Danaidae again are purely legendary figures. One of the Danaidae marries Lynceus, whose father is Abas. Abas is taken from the name of the Abantes; but as they lived principally in Euboea, other writers give him parents more suitable for this island, Poseidon or Chalcon (with reference to Chalcis), and Arethusa. The sons of Abas are Acrisius and Proitus, who, however, have more to do with the city of Tiryns. In the time of Proitus, Adrastus becomes king of Argos; he properly belongs more to Sicyon, but Argos could not afford to part with him. Thus of the long succession of rulers of Argos most are mere products of the imagination.[4]

Another example of the influence of imagination on the form assumed by early history is furnished by the personality of Minos. In Homer he is a son of Zeus, like Perseus, Dionysus, and Heracles; he is a companion of Zeus and a judge among the dead. If he was a comrade of Zeus, the conclusion was obvious that he used the wisdom which he received from Zeus, of which he had need as judge among the dead, for the benefit of mankind. Hence Hesiod makes him rule with the sceptre of Zeus over many men dwelling around him. But Minos also appears in Attic, Megarian, and Sicilian legends, and in Sicily his tomb even was shown. The next

step was easy ; he must have been a mighty ruler of the sea. He is presented in this light by Herodotus, who, however, considers him of divine origin, and consequently only a semi-historical personage, for, according to Herodotus, the first mortal who ruled the seas was Polycrates. Herodotus makes Minos rule over the islanders, who came from Caria, and were called Leleges. Thucydides, who is always ready to correct Herodotus, sets him right on this point. He asserts that Minos more probably drove out the Carians. According to Thucydides, Minos was the first king who possessed a fleet of war. All these different views are now blended into a picture of Minos as the first of the Greeks to introduce law and order, to found cities, and establish forms of worship, and traces of his naval supremacy have even been found in Egyptian history. We hold, on the contrary, that Minos is a mythical personage, like Perseus and Heracles, and that the actions which are ascribed to him as history are nothing but a gradual accretion of legendary embellishments. We might just as well look upon his colleague Aeacus as a historical personage, and commend his mild rule over his people.[5]

It would be easy to criticize other legends and show that even if they could have been founded on facts there is not the slightest probability that such was the case. Instead of this we prefer to dwell on the uncertainty of tradition in a whole class of cases, in which it is nowadays generally considered trustworthy. The descent of a family from a famous foreign hero is accepted as a proof of its having originally come from that district to which the hero in question is said to have belonged. Because Pisistratus, Solon, and others considered themselves Neleidae, people must have come from Pylos to Athens. This, however, is not a necessary conclusion.[6] The fact is that members of those families gave themselves out to be Neleidae, the reason being that they wished to attribute to themselves an illustrious descent, and the idea was probably suggested by the resemblance of their names to those of the Neleidae. If there

were some among them who bore the name of Pisistratus, this was sufficient to enable them to assert that they were descended from Pisistratus, son of Nestor. Other families of equal rank were only too ready to assent to such claims, for they were thus enabled to make similar ones. When we consider what pretensions in this respect are made in modern Europe and how unfounded they frequently are, we shall not be more inclined to accept them because they happen to have been made by ancient Athenians. And if they are not susceptible of proof with regard to the pedigree claimed, they cannot be of any authority for proving that a family originally came from a particular foreign place. The Neleidae must have come from Pylos, otherwise they were not Neleidae. But it was not necessary to establish as a historical fact that people had come from Pylos to Athens, in order to be able to set up a claim that a certain family traced its descent from Pylos. Had it been a notorious fact that some Pylians had come from there, so much the better for the assumption; but it was by no means necessary that this should be already known. It may be that Pylians did come to Athens, it may be probable on other grounds; but the alleged pedigree of Pisistratus does not prove it; and the same argument holds good in analogous cases.

We thus arrive at the conclusion that not only general considerations, but also the criticism of separate legends show us that tradition affords no solid basis on which to build early Greek history. What we can accomplish with their help is simply to continue the work of the old poets of the Cycle, of the logographers and the historians, and give a stylish façade to a building erected on sand. But, after all, of what advantage is it for the better understanding of antiquity if we do establish a definite connection between all the legends? Do we understand the character of the Greeks the better for it? The poetry of Homer as a picture of the inner life of the Greeks, the excavations at Troy, Mycenae, and Tiryns, and the legends

and myths in their traditional garb and regarded as products of the spirit of the people, throw far more light on Greek life and the Greek mind than any amount of lists of kings and genealogies, however authentic. What really interests us in Assyria and Egypt is not the exploits of this or that monarch, of whom we unfortunately know that they tried to impose grossly on posterity, but the peculiar civilization of the countries, and we should not be any the better acquainted with the state of Greek civilization in the times of the heroes, even if the existence of Minos really were an authenticated fact.[7]

So much for the heroes and their importance. We now turn to the ethnographical questions raised in the preceding chapter. How much truth is there left in what tradition teaches us of primitive Greek races, of their names and their civilization?

NOTES

1. This has been taken by modern writers from the introduction of Thucydides (I. 9), which is a wonderfully acute piece of writing for those days, almost inviting comparison with Machiavelli's introduction to his Florentine history. But with all due respect for the greatness of Thucydides, it is permissible to hold that we can form a better judgment than he could of many things which for him also were matters of erudition.

2. The genealogies of the rulers of Argos handed down by the ancients do not agree: cf. esp. Apollod. 2, 1, and Paus. 2, 16, as well as Grote I.[2] 59. In the text we have not followed any one of them exclusively, but have selected what seemed characteristic.

3. Iasus in Hellanic. fr. 38 M. Homer speaks (Od. 18, 246) of Ἴασον Ἄργος, from which passage an ingenious genealogist has invented a King Iasus of Argos. Cf. Grote I.[2] 59.

4. We can also trace these fabrications in the manner in which Heracles is brought into connection with Argolis. It was admitted that he was a native of Thebes. Hence Amphitryon and Alcmene were made to fly from Argolis to Thebes, that his birth might take place there, much in the same way that the Thessalian Phlegyas, whose daughter Coronis was mother of Asclepius, was made to wage war on Epidaurus, in order that Asclepius might be born there. Adrastus is regarded as properly belonging to Sicyon by Pauly's R. E. I. 1, 189. How little we can get out of the Argolian legends

which is of use for real history, has been shown by the most recent topographical investigations of Steffen (Text zu den Karten von Mykenai, Berl. 1884). According to him the ancient seat of the rulers of the Argolian plain was no doubt Argos. This agrees with the legend. Nauplia, Tiryns, Midea, and Mycenae were founded by foreign influence, and in rivalry with Argos (page 5 of the Text). But at this point legend and topographical investigations do not quite coincide. For the contrast between the "Protidae of Argos and the Perseidae" no longer corresponds to that between natives and foreigners alleged by the logographers; for the Protidae are no more native than the Perseidae, and the legend is silent on the relations between Tiryns and Nauplia, which are proved by the topographical conditions. In the same way topography leaves the region of legend when it makes the Pelopidae come "by the land route through Macedonia, and pour through the Isthmus into the plain of Inachus," whereupon they seize the citadel of the Perseidae at Mycenae and turn it into a camp on a large scale. With the exception of the fact that Agamemnon's rule extended to Corinth, the legend says nothing of the connection of the Pelopidae with the north, while it is the Perseidae who are in alliance with Corinth. Steffen's topographical investigations have a peculiar and very considerable historical value. Their results, however, do not acquire additional certainty by being based upon legend, which assumes so many shapes that it can be made to prove anything. The legend mentions different heroes: poets and logographers bring them into touch with one another; but neither the legends nor the logographers refer to a city's points of support or its means of defence.

5. Minos, Hom. Od. 19, 172 seq.; Hesiod, quoted by Plat. Min. 350; Herod. 3, 121; 1, 171; Thuc. 1, 4. The maritime supremacy of Minos, as brought into connection with the league of naval powers against Egypt by F. Lenormant (Die Anfänge der Cultur, Jena, 1875, Bd. 2, 223 seq.) is now accepted in French books as an actual fact. That Minos is not a historical personage is specially shown by the fact that there is no proof of a Cretan confederacy, which would be the fundamental condition of a kingdom of Minos. The Cretans always clung to municipal autonomy. The naval supremacy of Minos is the result of a combination of the legends about his movements, which are no more historical than those of Heracles.

6. The pedigrees of the old noble families are not recognised as satisfactory evidence by G. Petersen in his exhaustive treatise, Quaestiones de historia gentium Atticarum, Slesv. 1880 (Kieler Diss.). —We see from Paus. 2, 18, 8, how uncertain the supposed extraction of Athenian families from Pylos was. Pausanias does not know in

the least to what place the Nestorid Pisistratus came : *τοῦτον γὰρ οὐκ οἶδα παρ' οὕστινας ἀπεχώρησεν.* The same Pausanias, who, by the way, was rather credulous, has referred to the untrustworthiness of the genealogies, 1, 38, 7; 4, 2, 3 ; 8, 53, 5. We moderns, who understand historical criticism better than he did, should be a little more reserved in our acceptance of Greek genealogies which go back to the heroic age. Cf. also the excellent remarks of P. Gardner, New Chapters, 84, "as science is always progressive, we may hope by degrees to distil more and more history from these legends." He is speaking of the Pelopidae.

7. The only hero who appears to be somewhat more historical than the others is Theseus. He is said to have brought about the political union of Attica ; and there really was a political union of Attica, an exception in Greece. He has therefore left traces of the action ascribed to him. He is somewhat more historical than Romulus, for he has a genuine name, and rather less historical than Lycurgus, who is placed so much later. Whether a Theseus really did exist, no one of course can say. The stories of gods and of heroes blend into one another in Greece. To the Greeks the gods were as real and historical as the heroes. It has been very well observed by L. Schmidt, Ethik der Griechen, I. 60, that the strong instinct of personification in the Greeks was always creating new gods, and we may add that the same may be said of the heroes. Just as the Greeks left the various characters and personages belonging to the sphere of the gods in a fluid state, and did not trouble themselves about accuracy in names or apparent discrepancies, so they did with the heroes. They created new ones when it appeared necessary, for the heroes were religious characters to them. If the gods existed for them because they believed in them, all the more did the heroes have a real existence when they were necessary as the representatives of an idea, or in any other manner. The Greeks were thus free to invent new heroes, and they did so without stint. The objection that imaginary heroes are not real persons never occurred to them. The truth is that the heroes did not exist for them in the sense that a historical personage does for us. For the Greek people they existed as objects of religious faith ; for the scientific historian they have no individual existence.

CHAPTER VI

THE PELASGIANS. TRADITION AND REALITY

TRADITIONAL history, as we have seen, asserts that the Pelasgians were the earliest inhabitants of Greece, and that they afterwards became Hellenes.[1] But it would not be easy to find a warranty for the assertion. It is true that if we allow writers of the fifth century B.C. to rank as authorities for the events and circumstances of the twentieth or fifteenth, we obtain a foundation of a certain kind for the statement, if a very slender one. But if we do not believe that a serviceable tradition could last so long, we must look around for documents which are rather nearer to the times of which they treat. And in this case there is nothing older or better than the Homeric poems, which, even in their later portions, surpass in point of age all other documents. Pelasgians appear but little in Homer. They are mentioned as Asiatic auxiliaries of the Trojans, and not even as an important people. According to the Iliad, in Europe the Zeus of Dodona is a Pelasgian Zeus, just as the Thessalian Argos is Pelasgian. Hesiod expressly says that Dodona was the home of the Pelasgians. This is the only evidence which is, in point of time, in any proximity to the so-called Pelasgian age. Judging by these passages, they are a race whose home was in Epirus, Thessaly, and Asia Minor. No importance is ascribed to them as a rule in Greece. Later on the matter assumes quite a different aspect; first in Hesiod, who makes

Pelasgus the father of the Arcadian Lycaon, next in the writings of the genealogist and Epic poet Asius, whose date is possibly 700 B.C., and then in Herodotus. We read in a fragment of the former that the first man was Pelasgus, and in Herodotus that Hellas was originally called Pelasgia. But when we ask whence Herodotus obtained the information, we are told that he got it from the priests of Dodona, and the other information they gave him does not add to the credibility of this assertion. Besides, Herodotus' statements about the Pelasgians are by no means remarkable for clearness in respect of one of the most important points, their relation to Athens. He is speaking here of the Pelasgians of the past, and we need not be surprised if he could not be explicit on a subject which the learned men before him had brought into such hopeless confusion. On the other hand, his description of the Pelasgians of his time is simple and intelligible, and this part of his remarks has alone objective value. In Herodotus' time, or shortly before it, Pelasgians were still settled on the continent to the north of the Aegean Sea, and in a few islands near the Thracian coast. This agrees to a certain extent with Homer's account. We thus find at different times Pelasgians in the north of Greece, and farther in a north-easterly direction. But in Herodotus the fabric of Pelasgian greatness has the same imposing aspect and vagueness of outline which it possesses in the present day. According to him the Athenians were Pelasgians, as were also generally speaking the Ionians, and also the Aeolians and the Arcadians; only the Dorians were allowed to be Hellenes. How all those who were at first Pelasgians afterwards became Hellenes we do not learn from Herodotus, and we are not even told whether the ancient Pelasgians spoke a language differing from that of the Hellenes. How could Herodotus have known anything of these matters? A slightly different but more intelligible theory about the Pelasgians was started later by Ephorus. According to him the Pelasgians came from

Arcadia. They were a people of warlike habits and gathered round them others of like tastes, and in conjunction with them occupied various countries, *e.g.* parts of Crete and Thessaly. According to this theory the Hellenes were already in existence when the Pelasgians rose to power among them. We see how different these assertions are from those of Herodotus. The truth is that one knew just as little as the other of facts which were too remote from them, and each supplemented them by inventions and theories.

If we wish to understand how they arrived at such inventions, we must consider two points. The etymology ascribed by many writers to the word Pelasgic was of great importance. They connected it with *palai*, old, and thus saw in Pelasgus a representative of the earliest men, and in the Pelasgians the oldest people of Greece, for which there was originally no justification. This accounts for Herodotus declaring that nearly all the Greeks were Pelasgians, with the exception of the Dorians, who were later comers. This theory was favoured by the oracle at Dodona, which considered itself the genuine Pelasgian shrine. Hence too the Arcadians obtained the designation of Pelasgians, as they preserved their original simplicity longer than the other Greeks, and there is no authenticated record of the settlement of foreigners in Arcadia. Besides, Zeus was especially worshipped in Arcadia.

The theory of Ephorus that the Pelasgians were warlike people, and natives of Arcadia, who attained supremacy in other Greek countries, may be explained in a different way. It is part and parcel of a historical theory of a more general character which is widely diffused, and is found not only among the Greeks. In the East, as we learn from the Bible, the view prevailed that nations were descended from individuals who had borne the name of the people and communicated it to their descendants. The Ionians assume the existence of an Io, the Leleges of a Lelex, and so on. But then a

difficulty arose. Nations did not always have a single name. If there were several names a patronym must be found for each of them, and these patronyms could not all be placed at the commencement of the history of the people; this was possible for only one. The rest had to make their appearance at a later stage. For a single person to have given a new name to a whole people, he must have left a great mark on the history of that people. This usually happened when a foreigner arrived and interrupted the otherwise calm and peaceful development of the nation. Hence the frequent occurrence in early history of cases in which some man comes from abroad and obtains supreme power, whereupon the nation is renamed after him. But people wanted to know more. Why did he leave his native country? The arrangers of ancient history were prepared with an answer to even this question. Very often because he had become a fugitive through some quarrel or outrage—for no one is ready to leave his home of his own accord—and sometimes because his aid had been invoked elsewhere. The first of these two motives is the origin of a number of legendary facts for which it would be superfluous to try to find any historical warranty, for the simple reason that there is none. But we must go a step further.

If nations were named after individuals, who were not the fathers of the race, but who had only become their rulers in the course of history, it is possible that a nation might be named, not after one man, but after several, nay after a whole body of men, who have made themselves masters of the nation in question. This is very likely to have happened if the same race-name is found in different places. It is easier for several people to go to different places than for one man. This idea, which must also have occurred to others, is emphasized by Ephorus in reference to the Pelasgians. He says that the mention of Pelasgians in so many districts of Greece is due to the fact that numbers of these people, who,

in his opinion (following Hesiod, who had already made Lycaon the son of Pelasgus), were really a warlike Arcadian race, made themselves masters of these districts. This theory, which presses a number of eponyms into the service, is of no more value that the single-man theory. There is no reason why we should treat it as a remnant of ancient tradition.[2]

It cannot therefore be proved that a people, called Pelasgians, were ever of importance in the earliest ages of Greece. There were, as we know from Homer, Pelasgians in Asia and in Europe, but they never held a commanding position in Asia, and as for Europe, we only know that they lived in Epirus and Thessaly, but we do not hear that they were either numerous or powerful. In later antiquity more and more has been piled on the name of Pelasgian, until we have come to regard them as nothing less than the earliest Greek people. But this is a mistake. If it were only a question of having a name for a scientifically proved nationality, Pelasgian would do as well as any other. How many names are invented by modern science for a concise definition of a demonstrated whole! But the dubious point of the procedure in this case is that the name Pelasgian is not a pure invention, but was much used in antiquity; consequently if we apply it in an extended sense, the misconception easily arises that it originally had that wider meaning, and that most of the earliest Greeks were really called Pelasgians, which is neither demonstrable nor even probable. It has not even been proved that all the races, which are now described as Pelasgians, really stood in such close relationship to one another as to deserve a common name, which makes the use of the name all the more hazardous, especially as we shall see that even the pretended Pelasgic standard of civilization, the last refuge of those who desire to attach importance to the name of the Pelasgians, rests only upon unproved and improbable hypothesis.[3]

NOTES

1. The comments and hypotheses of different ages have swollen the material for this portion of Greek history to such bulk that it is impossible to enter into details here, which from our point of view are more valuable for archæology than for the history of antiquity. For the earliest times we have some careful compilations, among others that of H. G. Plass, Vor- und Urgeschichte der Hellenen, Lpz. 1831. Modern scholars have written at great length on the subject of the Pelasgians, as they have started with the idea that the statements of ancient writers since the time of Herodotus must be treated as authorities, and their various discrepancies reconciled and explained. A short and instructive essay on this subject is to be found in K. Fr. Hermann's Gr. Staatsalterthümer (5 Aufl.) §§ 6 and 7. A more recent dissertation published in Breslau, Bruck, Quae veteres de Pelasgis tradiderunt, I unfortunately have not seen.—Pelasgians are in Homer Trojan auxiliaries, Il. 2, 840 ; 17, 288. The Zeus of Dodona is Pelasgic, Il. 16, 233. The Thessalian Argos is Pelasgic, Il. 2, 681. There were Pelasgic deities in Crete, but only in the Odyssey, Od. 19, 177. The views lately propounded as to the date of different portions of the Homeric poems cannot modify our opinion. If some of the passages here quoted are of such recent origin that they cannot be described as Homeric at all, the non-appearance of the Pelasgians in Homer is all the more decisive and significant. Hesiod on the Pelasgians is quoted in Strabo, 7, 357; Asius in Paus. 8, 1, 4. Dodona is described as Πελασγῶν ἔδρανον, Hesiod quoted by Strabo, 5, 221 (Pelasgus father of Lycaon). Hellas originally Pelasgia, Her. 2, 56. For the Pelasgians in the time of Herodotus, Her. 1, 57 ; 5, 26 ; 7, 42. The spread of the name Larissa corresponds to the limitation of the Pelasgi to the northern districts and to Asia, Larissa being claimed as a genuine Pelasgic name by modern writers, as well as by antiquity. It appears three times in Thessaly, on the borders of Elis and Achaia, in Argolis and in Attica, also in the Troad, in Mitylene, at Cyme in Aeolis, at Ephesus, in Tralles, and finally in Crete ; we leave the Assyrian, Syrian, Pontine, and Campanian Larissa out of account. (The chief passages bearing on Larissa are Strabo, 440 and 620.) Larissaeans in Asia and Thessaly agrees with Homer's version. Their existence in Crete is not an argument for making them primitive inland Hellenes. The solitary Larissa of Argos may be regarded as a feeble support of the Ephorian view; but if it has no other support, the word Larissa is not of much use, since it belongs with its termination—*isa* or *issa*, to the

class of names of places in Asia Minor noticed by Kiepert (Lehrbuch, § 74). Thus on the whole, especially if we attach any weight to the word Larissa, there are more points in favour of the view that the Pelasgians were a maritime people. Hence many writers even in modern times, notably Kiepert, have declared them to be Semites (Lehrbuch, § 216), although the proofs of the theory do not seem conclusive at present. The statement that the alphabet was called Pelasgic (Diod. 3, 67) is too isolated to be of importance in this question. The Pelasgians rather belong to the class of tribes for which Curtius has proposed the name Ionian. But here again Dodona is a source of difficulty. For further remarks on the Pelasgians, see Herod. 1, 57; 8, 44 (the Athenians as Pelasgians); 1, 146 (the Arcadians); 7, 95 (the Æolians); and 7, 94 (the Ionians): Herod. on the Pelasgians in Attica, 2, 51, with Stein's notes. According to Herod. 1, 58, the Hellenes separated from the Pelasgians. — Ephorus' view is quoted in Strabo, 5, 221, who relies partly on Hesiod.—In the Pelasgian question the Pelasgians of Attica and the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians demand special consideration. The former built the walls of their citadel for the Athenians, lived under Hymettus, were banished and went to dwell at Lemnos, Herod. 6, 137. They came, according to Strabo, 9, 401, from Boeotia to Attica. Thuc. (4, 109) identifies them with the Tyrrhenians, while he says of the inhabitants of Chalcidicè Πελασγικόν, τῶν καὶ Λῆμνόν ποτε καὶ Ἀθήνας Τυρσηνῶν οἰκησάντων. The identity of the two names Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians is assumed also in a fragment of the Inachus of Sophocles, quoted by Dion. Hal. 1, 25. Dionysius says boldly: Τυρρηνίας μὲν γὰρ δὴ ὄνομα τὸν χρόνον ἐκεῖνον ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἦν; it is evident, however, that Sophocles meant by the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians merely the Argives, and this example shows how the ancients, in order to interpret a poetical passage, assert as a historical fact what was mere conjecture. The mass of records handed down from antiquity is full of spurious facts of this kind. They are mere commentators' hypotheses. Herodotus, on the other hand (1, 57), distinguishes between Pelasgians and Tyrrhenians dwelling somewhere in Thrace. It is therefore not even quite clear whether the ancient inhabitants of Lemnos, Imbros, and Placie (Herod. 1, 57), were ever called Tyrrhenians at all, or indeed whether there were any Tyrrhenians in Attica. Up to this point the confusion is great enough. But now comes the statement that a Lydian tribe was called Torrhebians and that Pelasgians dwelt in Asia Minor; in this way Tyrrhenus and Torrhebus got confused, while on the one hand the Etruscans (Tyrrhenians) were said to be derived from Lydia, and on the

other hand these same Etruscans were called simply Tyrrhenians instead of Pelasgians, Hellen. fr. I. Similar names fly about in the air like the balls of a juggler. In the meanwhile, however, an inscription has been found in Lemnos in Greek characters but in a language which the best specialists like DEECKE declare to be similar to the Etruscan, Die Tyrrhen. Inschrift von Lemnos, Rhein. Mus. 1886, p. 460. The Lemnian Tyrrhenians may therefore be a scattered remnant of the Etruscan nation. But the question of the existence of the Pelasgians is not solved thereby.

2. As regards the derivation of names it is worthy of notice that Thucydides has done for the Hellenes what Ephorus did for the Pelasgians. According to Thucydides (1, 3), the Greeks obtained the name of Hellenes from the fact that Hellen and his sons were warlike people from Thessaly, who gained repute in other countries —in this case they were not exiled, but summoned to render assistance. It is the same old method which invents facts as they are needed. It is interesting to notice here that there are three different stages of invention with the object of explaining the name of a people. (1) The nation is descended from one man and bears his name. (2) A man of this name makes himself ruler of a people already in existence and gives them his name. (The most striking and typical example is found in the case of the Oenotrians who were named Italians, Morgetae, and Sicels, because they were successively ruled by Italus, Morges, and Sicelus, Antioch. quoted in Dion. Hal. 1, 12, Σίκελος διέστησε τὸ ἔθνος.) (3) A number of persons became rulers by force or attained distinction by good service in one or more countries, and the nation was renamed after them; or the race was named after the leader with whom they emigrated, Dion. Hal. 1, 11, where Peucetius leads "his people" into the country. A parallel is found in Italy: "Lucani a Samnitibus orti, duce Lucio," Pliny, 3, 5.

3. We feel bound therefore to withhold our approval when learned modern scholars, who are authorities on the history of early Greek art and civilization, use the name Pelasgian to designate a certain epoch. It is not historical in this sense. For the Pelasgians cf. FRANCOTTE, Les populat. primit. de la Grèce, Paris, 1891, who entirely agrees with me; and E. MEYER, Forschungen zur griech. Gesch., I. Halle, 1892, who demonstrates at great length what I have proved briefly, but does not quote me, and is very proud of his proof, as though it were something original.

CHAPTER VII

OTHER NATIONS OF ANCIENT GREECE; LELEGES, CARIANS, MINYAE. SUPPOSED ADVANCE OF CIVILIZATION AMONG THE EARLIEST GREEKS; THE HEROIC AGES; IONIANS

ALTHOUGH the Pelasgians do not deserve the prominent position which writers wish to assign to them, there are other races which are often mentioned in the earliest Greek history, in part purely Greek, in part semi-Oriental. Among the latter the Carians come first. But with them tradition links another people, whom we will therefore discuss before the Carians, because their actual history and the position assigned to them by scholars make them a parallel to the Pelasgians. We refer to the Leleges. In Homer[1] they appear, like the Pelasgians, only on the Asiatic side of the Aegean, as allies of the Trojans, while later historians represent them as spread over half Greece. According to the latter, they are natives of Acarnania, Locris, Boeotia, Megaris, Laconia, Messenia, and Pylos. A great part of these statements is due to no less an authority than Aristotle.[2] According to the ancient historians they, with the Pelasgians, fill nearly the whole of Greece; for what the Leleges did not inhabit—Thessaly, Attica, and Arcadia—is in the possession of the Pelasgians. They also resemble the Pelasgians in having Lelex for their first man or first king in several districts, *e.g.* in Acarnania and Laconia, while he is said to have come to Megara from

Egypt. They are also considered as identical with the Carians, or at least as their comrades and allies. At a later period we have the valuable information that the Leleges originally possessed the coast from Ephesus to Phocaea, as well as Chios and Samos; that they were bondsmen of the Carians in Asia, that certain places were pointed out there as the home of the Leleges, and that in Caria many ruined castles bore the name of castles of the Leleges. Moreover Pelasgian Leleges appear in one instance in Asia. The parallel with the Pelasgians is thus fairly complete. In Homer the Leleges appear, like the Pelasgians, on the Asiatic side; in historical times there are traces of them in Asia, while the Pelasgians are found to the north of the Aegean. Tradition in short divides European Greece between them and the Pelasgians. But at this point they cease to be anything but mere names. Their existence is even less real than that of the Pelasgians, whose Dodonian Zeus is incontrovertible. Starting from the idea that the tradition recording the spread of the Leleges over half Greece is true, and that a distinct civilization must be demonstrated for this important element in Greek history, a modern investigator has displayed great industry in arranging and testing all the materials at his disposal, and has come to the conclusion that the following are Lelegic in origin: the worship of Artemis, especially that at Ephesus; the custom of keeping at the temples a number of priestesses of inferior rank, the so-called ἱερόδουλοι ἑταῖραι; the worship of Apollo Carneius in Laconia; and the festival of Hyacinthia. Unfortunately there is absolutely no proof of all this. What he describes as Lelegic peculiarities, with the exception of the Ephesian Artemis, is not ascribed to them by the ancients, and does not even occur in what are called the Lelegian districts of Greece.

With the Carians matters are somewhat different. Here we are treading on really historical ground. For that very reason, however, the traces of this people in Greece itself are

less widely spread. They certainly lived in Megara, where even in historical times there was a citadel called Caria, and in Epidaurus and Hermione. It has not been proved that they also lived in Attica; the legend only states that they devastated the coasts of Attica. This agrees with their supremacy over the islands of the Aegean, which appears to be a historical fact. It is said that they exercised considerable influence on the civilization of the Greeks, and in particular left traces in the history of armour, the double handle and escutcheon on the shield and the plume on the helmet being regarded as Carian innovations. The Carians were even in historical times a well-known and widely-spread people, who were looked upon by the Greeks as barbarians.

We pass over a number of unimportant races who are expressly ascribed to the earliest ages of Greece, such as the Curetes, Caucones, Abantes, Dryopes, and others, all nebulous figures with the exception of the Dryopes, who appeared later. But there is another people whom we cannot omit, a people of great reputation, the Minyae, who bring us into more genuine history.[3] The oldest accounts of the Minyae are to be found in Homer, where the Boeotian Orchomenus is mentioned as a Minyan city. He describes it as one of the richest of cities, comparable even to the Egyptian Thebes. Later writers have more to say about them. They cultivated the district which contains the Copaic Lake. From Boeotia they migrated to Thessaly, whence they despatched the Argonautic expedition. There were Minyae in Lemnos who were said to be descended from the Argonauts. Driven out of this island by Pelasgians from Athens, they took refuge on the Peloponnesian promontory of Taenarum, whence some assisted in the Laconian colonization of the island of Thera, while others settled in the six towns of the Elean Triphylia. The genealogists make the first ruler of Orchomenus the son of Peneius, and bring the Minyae into relation with the tyrannical race of the Phlegyae. This genealogy is used to contradict

Strabo and show that the Minyae did not move from Boeotia to Thessaly, but from Thessaly to Boeotia. The connection between the Argonautic legends and the Minyan harbours seems to prove that the Minyae were good sailors, and the splendour of Orchomenus and its ruins show that they were in close communication with the East.

With the Minyae we come to the so-called Heroic Age of Greece.[4] The family histories of the heroes now begin. The Minyae introduce us to the most widely-spread family of that age, that of the Aeolidae. The first ruler of Orchomenus, it is true, was not an Aeolid, viz. Andreus, son of Peneius, who was succeeded by his son Eteocles. But then a new dynasty begins with Almus the son of Sisyphus, and Sisyphus is an Aeolid. The family of the Aeolidae was gradually much enlarged, for Homer mentions only two, Sisyphus and Cretheus, while Hesiod adds Salmoneus. The complete pedigree contains seven sons and five daughters. Through the sons a number of races, which in later times were called Aeolians, were united to one another; one of the daughters serves to bring the western peoples of Greece into closer relation with the rest of the Greeks. Calyce is married to Aethlius, and the descendants of these two are Epeius, Aetolus, and Paean. Aetolus leaves the Peloponnese and wanders northward; he is the father of Pleuron and Oeneus, the king of Calydon; from Oeneus are sprung the heroes Tydeus and Diomedes. Here we can plainly see the drift of these inventions. Calyce could not have found a better husband than Aethlius, whose name denotes a hero of the games, and points to those which in later times were celebrated in Elis. Patronyms of the Epeians and Aetolians had to be invented, also a representative of the city of Pleuron, while with Paean we are brought once more to the history of civilization. These are all inventions. The Aeolidae contain all possible shades of civilization and religion, and they deserve their name (Aeolidae-Motley). Nephele in the legend of Athamas is a

nature myth; Melicertes is the Semitic Melkarth; Glaucus and Bellerophon represent the Lycian worship of Apollo, and its removal to Corinth and Argos; Admetus and Alcestis represent the bucolic and sentimental side of the legends of Apollo. We cannot agree with later writers in considering these Aeolic legends as the beginnings of the history of the states on the European littoral; we can only see in them endeavours to create genealogies by the conventional method of fabrication with the help of different local legends, which in this instance are to serve as proofs of the original connection of all the various Greek races known under the name of Aeolians. These Aeolians, who really appear only in Asia as such, were in all probability not a homogeneous race like the Dorians and Ionians; but the name was there and required an original ancestor, without which nothing could be done. It would have been easy enough to invent an Aeoleus, but as an Aeolus already existed, in fact two of that name, it was just as simple to join them on to him; and thus Thessalians and Boeotians, in their character of chief representatives of the ancestors of the Aeolian races in Asia Minor, were attached to him by means of his sons, while in the case of the races in Elis and Aetolia the connection was made through his daughters.[5]

A desire naturally exists to extract some useful information from these genealogies respecting the movements of the races, and this is generally done. According to the prevailing view the Minyans migrated from Thessaly to Boeotia, and the Aetolians came originally from Elis. But if, as is clearly established, there is a good deal of invented matter in all these legends, how can we pick out what is not invented? What rational history can deal with personages who appear on the scene in close connection with Aethlius and Paean? Of course, migrations of races took place in the earliest times, but had any one in the eighth century B.C. even a faint idea of what had really happened? We therefore maintain that

Aeolians under that name existed first in Asia Minor, after the Dorian migration; that an ancestral hero was required for these Aeolians and found in Aeolus, who in Homer is the father of Sisyphus and Cretheus; that all Greek races who did not belong to the Dorians or Ionians were fastened on to Aeolus, and grouped together under the generic name of Aeolians; that all the details of genealogical relationship between the Aeolidae in Corinth, Boeotia, Thessaly, Aetolia, and Elis, are invented as to one part, and as to the other cannot be proved to be true, consequently that, before the Dorian migration, there was no race and no stage of civilization which could rightly be called Aeolian.

While the Aeolians are not mentioned by Homer, the name of the Achaeans[6] is, on the other hand, of the greatest importance in the poems. The Achaeans are, according to him, firstly, the inhabitants of Phthiotis, secondly, of Peloponnesian Argos, which is called Achaean, and finally, the general body of the Greeks fighting before Troy, so that the name Achaeans is of equal significance with Argives and Danai. In historical times we find in the Peloponnese a people bearing the name of Achaeans, and settled on the north coast, whither they were driven by the Dorian invasion. There can consequently be no doubt that this people who, before the Dorian migration, inhabited Argolis and probably Laconia, were distinguished by the name of Achaeans. Heracles himself was held to be an Achaean.

In Homer the name Ionians[7] is generally used to designate the Athenians. But some people who were settled on the Peloponnesian coast to the south of the Saronic Gulf, *e.g.* in Troizene, appear to have been also early designated as Ionians; and the dwellers on the southern coast of the Corinthian Gulf, who at the conquest of the Peloponnese by the Dorians had to make room for the dislodged Achaeans, were on this occasion styled Ionians.

So much for the names of the leading Greek races in the

earliest times. What do we know of the state of their civilization? The traditions of poets and genealogists have been used of late to compose the following picture of the inner development of the Greeks at that period. The oldest inhabitants of Greece, the Pelasgians, were a simple, peace-loving people, who had no other gods but Zeus. New customs and new gods were brought from Asia by the Phoenicians, from whom the Greeks also learned navigation. With the Phoenicians came various Asiatic peoples akin to the Pelasgians, the Leleges, Carians, and others, all comprised under the name of Ionians.[8] According to this picture, the supposed Pelasgians worshipped the most high God without images or temples. The assertion rests on the stories told by the priests of Dodona to Herodotus. According to this version the Pelasgians used no names in their worship, and such names first came to them from the barbarians. They had asked the oracle at Dodona whether they might accept them, and the oracle had given them permission to do so. That this story is an invention of the priests is evident on the face of it; and it is not accepted as genuine history. But there is also no reason for deducing from it the assumption that the Greek religion was originally pure. If this purity were a reality, it must be explained how the Greeks arrived at a plurality of gods later. Such an attempt has been made. It is said that there existed in the Greek mind a polytheistic element, which was developed when the different aspects of the deity became prominent in the different cantons. This reason, however, shows that the presumed purity of primitive Greek religion is an impossibility; for the Greeks always lived in different cantons, and for that reason there must always have been several deities worshipped by them. But all Aryans had a plurality of gods, and consequently there was always polytheism in Hellas, only less developed in earlier than in later times.

Further, it is said that it was the Phoenicians who

supplied the leavening element in Greek development. The Greeks are even said to have learned the art of navigation from them. That the Phoenicians contributed much to the development of the Greeks, is certain, but in the marked degree accepted by many in the present day not at all probable. Those who emphasize the close connection between the coasts of Asia Minor, the islands and European Greece, should be the last people to require the Phoenicians for the introduction of the art of navigation among the inhabitants of these districts. If the next port of call was in actual sight, if the mainland was a stepping-stone to the islands and the islands to the mainland, there was no need to wait for people to come from a distance to teach them navigation. An importance is ascribed to the Phoenicians which does not belong to them. Their intervention was not necessary for the spread of Oriental civilization into Greece. For was not Asia Minor always open to Oriental influence? Why should it not have gradually spread by the most natural means over the islands and the coasts of Greece? When it is a question of hypothesis, and the modern theories of early Greek history are nothing more, the simpler is preferable to the more complex.

As the result of Eastern influence there arose in Greece, according to the views of the present day, a heroic age in which events occurred much as they are related by the epic poets and the genealogical historians. But a period of war following the simplicity of the Pelasgic age can only be proved if the creations of poets and genealogists, and the tales of Dodonian priests, are realities. We can accept the local legends as such, without being obliged to adopt the system which the ancients have left us. It is possible that the exploits and fortunes of Adrastus, Tydeus, Achilles, Theseus, Jason, Admetus, and others are not the invention of later poets, but are based on popular legends, but at any rate in the legends they were isolated and without date; and

because it suited the genealogists to bring them into closer relation with one another, we have no right to pronounce them to be history, and to assume a warlike age lasting for about two centuries, in which the newly-awakened spirit of feud is alleged to have produced such brilliant results. The peaceful Pelasgians of this story fought with each other just as much as Adrastus did with the Thebans. It is utterly improbable that the influence of the Phoenicians produced the warlike results which have been ascribed to it. If savages are not warlike in themselves they will not become so by dealing with English merchants.[9]

It is far more probable that the Greeks became more and more civilized, and perhaps somewhat effeminate, by constant intercourse with the East, until in the end the supposed heroes[10] were defeated and reduced to submission by a really vigorous people, like the Dorians.[11]

It is possible that the Greeks who from time to time migrated to Europe from Asia Minor bore the name of Ionians in very early times. It is true that the name Javan, in the list of nations in Genesis, cannot be a satisfactory proof of this theory, for this list dates from a period subsequent to the Dorian migration; now, however, the name of Ionians, which had been already found by Champollion in the catalogue of the allies of the Khetas against Rameses II. (about 1380), has been discovered there again. At all events, in this matter we agree with Curtius. We think as he does, that from very early times Greeks lived just as much on the Asiatic coasts as on the European, and we do not understand by what right Chios and Samos are so often reckoned as colonies, while Crete is included among the countries originally Greek. There was assuredly more Hellenic civilization in Samos and Chios than in Crete, and the theory that when the Ionians came to Chios and Samos after the Dorian migration, they found there a people more foreign to the Greeks than the Dorians had found in Crete,

rests on no proof. The difference is that there are supposed to be dates for the settlements of Greeks in Chios and Samos, while for the colonizing of Crete there are admittedly none. But this is of no consequence one way or the other. The coasts and islands of Asia Minor are ancient Greek.[12]

NOTES

1. Leleges, Hom. Il. 20, 96; 10, 429, together with δῖοι Πελασγοί. Locus classicus, Strabo 7, 321, 322. Arist. fr. 127, quoted by Str., 321, in reference to Acarnania, Locri, Boeotia, Megaris, Leucas; Paus. 4, 36, 1, for the Megarid and Pylos; 4, 1, 1, for Laconia.—Lelex to Megara from Egypt, Paus. 1, 39, 6; 44, 3. Leleges on the Ionic coast, Pherec. fr. 111, quoted by Str. 632; acc. to Ephorus, fr. 32 M., even on the site of Miletus, which is generally considered a Carian settlement.—Leleges as slaves of the Carians, Ath. 6, 281, quoted from Philippus, a historian.—Pelasgic Leleges, Steph. Byz. s.v. Νινόη.—For the Leleges cf. esp. K. W. Deimling, Die Leleges, Lpz. 1862; and, disagreeing utterly with him, H. Kiepert in the Monatsber. der Berl. Acad. 1861, p. 114 seq.; also in his Lehrbuch, p. 240 (Illyrians). Deimling starts with the correct idea that there must be some reason for ascribing to the Leleges a wide range of expansion. This reason really is, not that given by him, *i.e.* the facts connected with their worship, but the arbitrary combination of their authenticated dwelling-places and of their names made in antiquity. The first reason is the following. Their home, like that of the Carians, was on the coast of Asia Minor, and they were without doubt, like them, a maritime people, and thus visited many places. The second reason lies in their name. The name is explained by Hesiod, who is quoted by Strabo, 322, as that which Zeus λεκτοὺς ἐκ γαίης λάους πόρε Δευκαλίωνι, to which Strabo adds, συλλέκτους γεγονέναι. The deduction from this was easy for the poets and logographers. An ancient maritime people, which was either a conglomeration of peoples of different origin or perchance the men presented by Zeus to Deucalion, were sure to be found everywhere, especially in places where there were seafaring folk (like the Teleboae in Acarnania) or where etymology would seem to allow it (the Locrians as descendants of the Leleges). This explains how the Leleges are put in so many places in which they were probably never seen. Acc. to Menodotus, fr. 1, Müll. 3, 103, the temple of Hera in Samos was of Lelegean origin.

2. Carians. In Megara, Paus. 1, 40, 6. In Epidaurus and

Hermione, Str. 8, 274. Supposed to be in Attica because of the passage in Herod. 5, 66, which at the very most proves that on one occasion a Carian migrated to Athens. In the islands, Thuc. 1, 8, where Carians and Phoenicians are fairly equally balanced, a fact which does not appear to have been specially noted, although it is not uninteresting. Inventions of the Carians in Herod. 1, 17; Strabo, 14, 661, and other passages quoted by Helbig, Hom. Epos, 229. Helbig treats the subject exhaustively. Acc. to Herod. 5, 88, even the so-called Ionic female robe is κάειρα. Carian inventions were known to the Ionians of the Homeric Epos (Helb. 231). It appears that there is much that is Carian in the so-called Ionian civilization.—Curetes in Aetolia and Euboea, Str. 462-68.—Caucones in Messenia and southern Elis, Str. 345.—Abantes in Euboea, Str. 445.—Dryopes, Str. 373, 434, in the later Doris on Mt. Oeta, in Styra and Carystus in Euboea, afterwards in the island of Cythnos, and in Asine and Hermione.

3. Minyae, O. MÜLLER, Geschichten hellenischer Stämme und Städte I. Orchomenos und die Minyer, Breslau, 1820; Str. 414, 415; Paus. 9, 34, 6 seq.

4. Collection of Greek myths from antiquity in the Bibliotheca of Apollodorus (Müller, fr. 1) to which there is an exhaustive commentary by Heyne.

5. Aeolians. Thessaly is so specially regarded as Aeolian territory, that acc. to Diod. 4, 67, its ancient name was Aeolis. This information is worth as much as that which tells us that Hellas was once called Pelasgia. This again is one of the naïve artifices of Greek manufacture of history, to assert that a country had such and such a name in ancient times. The name perhaps existed, but not always as that of the particular country. Sicily is an example. It was boldly asserted in antiquity that it was formerly called Trinacria. Yet this is probably merely a corruption of Thrinacie, which was incorrectly supposed to refer to Sicily in a passage in Homer. The most important Aeolian districts of later times are Thessaly and Boeotia. Acc. to Thuc. 3, 102, the country about Pleuron and Calydon was likewise called Aeolis: it is obvious why Calyce was introduced into the genealogies. As for the Aeolians, I agree entirely with Duncker, 5, 356, 366; as also in holding, as I do, that the existence of an Aeolian dialect was asserted merely because they wished to contrast all the Greek dialects with the decidedly more developed ones of the Dorians and Ionians. For the dialects cf. Brugmann's Gr. Gramm., § 3, in Iw. Müller's Handbuch der Klass. Alterthumsw. The general body of the Greeks were called Aeolians after subtracting these two most famous and most vigorous races.

6. Achaeans. Hom. Il. 2, 683 *οἵ τ' εἶχον Φθίην ἠδ' Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα Μυρμιδόνες δὲ καλεῦντο καὶ Ἕλληνες καὶ Ἀχαιοί.* Argos Achaikon, Il. 9, 141, and elsewhere.

7. Ionians. *Ἴάονες ἑλκεχίτωνες* Il. 13, 685, are evidently Athenians by reason of line 685 ; this does not prevent other people on the Saronic Gulf from having had the same name.

8. Route followed by Greek civilization, acc. to Curtius, I. 46. Herod. 2, 52, mentions the priests of Dodona.

9. The old tale of the pious and worthy Pelasgians is now reinforced in popular treatises of antiquarians by another story of barbarous Pelasgians, who offered human sacrifice to Zeus, and to whom the Ionians imparted their civilizing worship of Apollo, and one theory is just as well founded as the other. There are no grounds for the antithesis. The civilizing Apollo is a personage belonging to the age following the Dorian migration when oracles flourished, and transferred to an early period ; the worshippers of Apollo in primitive times could hardly have had milder customs than those of Zeus, to whom human sacrifice was rarely offered.

10. Helbig has shown very neatly that the Homeric Epic does not represent the Heroes as very warlike, Hom. Epos, pp. 293, 294.

11. As analogies have been drawn from natural science, especially from geology, in the study of Greek history, another analogy of the same kind, which will make our views clearer, may not be out of place here. Formerly the theory of great and sudden catastrophes prevailed in geology, now the view is widely held that changes are brought about in nature gradually by the operation of continuing causes. This, we believe, and we think it necessary to emphasize the idea, was the case with the influence of the East upon Greece. We do not assume firstly a period of Pelasgian simplicity and then a warlike epoch produced by Ionian and Phoenician influences, but we assert that the Greeks and barbarians of Asia exerted a constantly increasing influence upon the European Greeks, who were from the first as fond of fighting and as polytheistic as their Aryan brethren, and would have been much more capable of bringing about the subsequent reaction, which is called the Dorian migration, if they had never had the character of peaceableness which is ascribed to their early career.

12. E. Curtius, Ionier vor der ionischen Wanderung, 1855, and his Gr. Gesch. I. Bk. 1. note 7.—We fully adopt his main idea, that the coast of Asia Minor is just as much ancient Greek soil as European Greece, and consider it a distinct scientific step in advance. For the Jevanna among the allies of the Khetas, cf. W. M. Müller, Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern,

Lpz., 1893, pp. 355, 369. With reference to the ancient expansion of the Greeks over a portion of Asia Minor, we make the following remarks in agreement with Curtius' view: — According to ancient tradition Greek colonies came in the earliest times to Cyprus (Acamas, son of Theseus), to Lycia and Pamphylia, cf. Herod. 7, 90, 91: Teucrus, Lycus, Calchas. This is usually regarded as a fable. On the other hand, E. MEYER, Gesch. des Alterthums, I. § 279, is inclined to admit that Greek settlements from the west in Cyprus and Pamphylia preceded the Ionian migration. Why, however, we ask, should European Greeks have gone so far afield at a time when places nearer home were unclaimed? Is it merely on account of Greek tradition, which connects them with the Trojan War? Is it not more natural—assuming their Greek character even in early times—to say that they were the remains of the old Greek population of Asia Minor? The descent of the Cyprians and Pamphylians from Greeks who were returning home from Troy has as much value for Asia Minor as the supposed origin of the Oenotrians and other races coming from Greece, and the settlement of Diomedes and other heroes in Italy; moreover it happens that Calchas appears in both countries.

CHAPTER VIII

REMAINS OF EARLY ART IN GREECE: TROY, MYCENAE, ORCHOMENUS, TIRYNS

WHAT then do we know in detail of the condition of the Greeks in the age preceding the Dorian migration? First and foremost we have the results of the discoveries which have been made on Greek soil, and fortunately in places which in ancient times were looked upon as the chief seats of power and civilization in that early age. Mycenae, Orchomenus, Tiryns, and Troy have been the scenes of the most interesting discoveries of modern times, thanks to the energy and enthusiasm of Heinrich Schliemann. These discoveries have enriched our knowledge of the life of antiquity in an extraordinary degree, and have raised many a problem for science to solve.

Of these places Troy was in the most primitive stage of civilization.[1] Opinions had been hitherto divided as to its position. In modern times precedence was given to the view which placed the town of Priam on the hill of Bunarbaschi; and if an opinion as to the site of the city is to be formed only from the Homeric poems and from a general idea of Troy's importance, Bunarbaschi, by reason of its strong and lofty position, certainly has the advantage over all other places that might answer to the description. But the criteria produced by Schliemann are still more important than these. While no remains of importance have ever been found on Bunarbaschi,

on another hill nearer the sea, the hill of Hissarlik, which in later antiquity was the site of the new town of Ilium (considered by most of the ancients to be also that of the famous Troy), such an immense accumulation of old ruins has been found, and so great a number of remarkable objects have been exhumed for our admiration and inquiry, that we can have no reasonable doubt that the city which the poets had in their mind's eye when they related the tale of the Trojan war, was on the spot described by Schliemann, even if it does not exactly correspond to the idea of Troy which we gather from Homer.

Immediately eastwards of the promontory of Sigeum, a valley descending from the slopes of Mount Ida opens towards the Hellespont, about eight miles long and two and a half broad, and watered by two streams, the larger one, the Scamander, to the south, and the Simois to the north, which unite close to the sea. In this valley, about three miles from the sea-shore, there rises a hill about 160 feet high, the last spur of a mountain ridge, with a summit of moderate dimensions, 600 by 900 feet, in all about sixty thousand square yards. On this spot Schliemann, who was assisted later by Dörpfeld, began to make excavations in 1870, and obtained surprising results. It proved to be the site of several cities, each lying on the ruins of its predecessor, and forming a mass of *débris* about 45 feet high. The second layer from the bottom is extremely remarkable. It presented materials for a topographical sketch : a city wall, the upper part of quarried stone, and the lower of bricks baked in the sun, with towers and three gateways, and large halls. Various interesting objects were found in it, such as vases (among them the so-called picture-vases), utensils in stone and bronze, and, what created the greatest sensation, a rich collection of gold articles, which Schliemann has called the treasure of Priam. It consists of golden cups, bracelets, earrings, and head-bands, most of them without ornamentation. The enormous stratum of scoriae

which covered the city recalls the conflagration which destroyed Troy. The ornaments, which were piled together as if for removal in case of sudden danger, correspond to the fame of the wealth of Troy. But many other details do not agree with Homer's narrative, such as the small extent of the ruins and the much more primitive standard of civilization. But this of course does not prevent us from identifying Hissarlik with Troy. Poets are not statisticians, especially when they live centuries after the events which they relate. The view that these discoveries in ancient Troy belong to the primitive history of Greece is not justified merely by our idea of the close relationship of the races dwelling on the shores of the Aegean, but also by the Homeric descriptions themselves, which do not reveal any national difference between Greeks and Trojans.

The oldest stratum of ruins upon the island of Thera[2] appears to be a little more recent than the second town of Hissarlik. Here volcanic eruptions have buried many remains of primary ages, and implements of stone and copper as well as vases have been found in a well-preserved stratum of ruins evidently of Phoenician origin. The inhabitants of Thera sowed barley.

The discoveries at Mycenae introduce us to another and still more brilliant world.[3]

Between the valley which sends its waters westward of the Acrocorinthus into the Corinthian Gulf, and the valley of the Inachus, the chief river of the plain of Argos, there rises the mountain of Treton, which is a spur of the chains of the Argolic peninsula, and is traversed by the road from Corinth to Argos. Close to the point at which the road descends to the south, on the eastern slopes of the mountain, commanding the plain and guarding the pass to the north, lies the city of the Atreidae, Mycenae. It must have been a large city, extending at least a thousand yards from north to south, and six hundred from east to west. At the north-eastern extremity is the citadel, in the form of an irregular triangle. In

the space just inside the entrance there is a circle formed by a double row of stone slabs, in the western part of which Schliemann found five large tombs, twenty to thirty-five feet below the present surface of the ground, to which has recently been added a sixth, excavated by the Archaeological Society of Athens (1876-1877). They contained altogether seventeen bodies, not all buried in the orderly manner which respect for death demands, but some of them appearing to have been thrown in haste into the tombs. The bodies were partially burnt before or at the time of burial. Buried with them was found a large number of objects of the most varied kind.

The third tomb — the first and second being of minor importance—contained three bodies, nearly 700 round plates of gold ornamented with regularly stamped patterns, a large head-piece made of bands of gold, three square gold plates with engravings, and a gold cup. The fourth tomb contained five bodies, of which four had golden masks on their faces, a dagger of bronze, with inlaid golden ornamentation representing a lion hunt, a gold lion's mask, a silver bull's head, gold rings, vases of alabaster and amber beads. Similar discoveries were made in the other graves. Besides these, pottery and roughly-worked idols were found everywhere. On the top, amid the *débris*, Schliemann found several grave-stones upon which are represented charioteers and spiral ornaments in relief; these evidently served to indicate the position of the tombs. Carved stones and pieces of pottery of great interest for the history of art were also found outside the tombs. The section of the citadel which contains the tombs is separated from the rest. The whole citadel is enclosed by a strong wall of Cyclopean or Pelasgic architecture, *i.e.* built of blocks of irregular form. It does not however belong entirely to the oldest type of this style. Both the contents of the graves of Mycenae and the walls show traces of different periods. Moreover, points especially exposed to attack had to be strengthened by walls more carefully constructed. This

explains the superior workmanship of the passage leading from outside to the main gateway of the citadel, the famous Lions' Gate, which before Schliemann's discoveries was the chief monument of primitive Greek art, and is still one of the most important. Over the gateway, which is ten feet high and averages nine feet in width, lies a gigantic stone, sixteen feet in length, six and a half feet in height, and three feet in thickness, above which, to relieve the downward pressure, a triangular gap has been left, filled in front by an ornamental slab. This slab is ornamented with two lions rampant on either side of a pillar in relief, unfortunately without their heads, but the bodies, in contrast to most of the productions of Asiatic art, exhibit an endeavour to present a faithful and unexaggerated copy of nature.

But the importance of Mycenae in the history of Greek art is not confined to the tombs of the Acropolis and the Lions' Gate. The remains of at least six remarkable buildings have been found in the lower city, the so-called treasuries, of a kind not met with in later times in Greece.

The largest and best preserved is the so-called treasury of Atreus, well known from early times, but only recently completely excavated by Schliemann. A passage leads to a door, higher but narrower than the Lions' Gate and built in the same style. The interior is a vault about sixteen yards high and of the same breadth. The vault is not built of stones hewn into the shape of a wedge, but of horizontal layers, which become gradually narrower towards the top. At the entrance there were decorated pillars of coloured marble. The accumulation of earth on the roof prevented the dome from being seen from the outside. A similar building exists not far from the Heraeum, on the road to Argos.

To the north of Athens, close to Menidi, the ancient Acharnae, a building of the same kind has been found, which has proved to be a tomb. Evidently the dome-shaped buildings of Mycenae were also tombs and not treasure-houses, as

supposed by the ancients, or perhaps, as P. Gardner thinks, they served both purposes. The tomb at Menidi contained similar objects to those found in the tombs at Mycenae, but of far less importance; the same may be said of the cave-tombs found in Attica near Spata (the deme Paeania) and of the tombs hollowed out of the mountain near Nauplia. A dome-shaped grave has also been discovered in Bapheium (Vaphio) near Amyclae, which has yielded among other things some gold cups with decorations of great importance.

The whole plan of Mycenae and the fortification of the mountain-passes leading to the north, which are explained by the latest German topographical sketches, display great judgment and reflection. It is evident that the importance of Mycenae as a fortress was caused by its position opposite Argos, which commanded a portion of the plain, and that the northern mountain-passes were secured to protect the rear and leave its whole force available for operations towards the south.

The city which holds the third place of importance in the history of earliest Greek civilization is the Boeotian Orchomenus,[4] which lies at the western extremity of the Copaic Lake close to the modern Skripu. Nothing remains, however, of its former grandeur but the famous Treasury of Minyas, a circular building in the same style as the Mycenaean treasuries described above. It has been excavated by Schliemann. The main apartment contained nothing remarkable, but in a side chamber were found some of the stone slabs which served as a roof. The agreement of the decoration used here with that found in a tomb in Egyptian Thebes, belonging at the very latest to the twelfth century B.C., is one of the most important facts for the history of early Greek art and its origin.

The fourth of the primitive towns is Tiryns. Here until quite lately the walls were the only subjects of study.[5] Tiryns lies between Nauplia and Argos, upon a rock rising slightly out of the plain. The walls consist of regular layers

of huge almost unhewn rocks, ranging up to nine feet in length and three in thickness. They are as much as twenty-five feet thick in places, but are not solid throughout. In certain places an inner gallery has been built running parallel to the walls, the roof of which consists of stone slabs overlapping one another and gradually converging, with openings outwards. The original height of this wall is estimated at sixty feet, and Cyclopes from Lycia are said to have been its architects. The Homeric epithet for Tiryns, the walled city, indicates that the walls were looked upon as unique of their kind. All this has been long known, but Schliemann has lately discovered some remains of a large building, hitherto almost unknown, which gives us an idea of a palace of that period, and in which much of the decoration is noteworthy, especially a wall which bears a strong resemblance to the roof at Orchomenus.

We cannot refer here to the other remains of so-called Cyclopean or Pelasgic walls found in Greece, for they may just as likely be of later origin—for people who wished to save themselves the trouble of hewing the stones into rectangles may in later times have used irregular blocks, and the style of construction, whether with four-cornered or irregular blocks, depends very much on the kind of stone used—but we may mention the grand ruins of Gulàs on the Copaic Lake, because many persons consider this the site of the most ancient Orchomenus, though without good reason.[6]

Of the five places above described, the remains of Troy exhibit the oldest stage of civilization, while Thera comes next. Then come the walls of Tiryns, then Mycenae, the palace of Tiryns and Orchomenus. But the decorative remains show that Tiryns continued to be a seat of culture when Mycenae and Orchomenus became important. The connection between Tiryns and Mycenae is also evident. The position and remains of both these cities show that the same race possessed both strongholds, and received its culture from

the East, at first fixing its citadel in Tiryns near the sea, and afterwards establishing itself on a more imposing scale in Mycenae, where it managed to secure itself from hostile attacks on every side.

The objects discovered in these places raise many questions. It is clear that on its artistic side this civilization came from the East, and not only from Asia, but also from Egypt. But the particular origin of many classes of works of art, especially those found in Mycenae, is not so obvious. For it cannot be proved that everything is directly imitated from Asiatic or Egyptian art. Much remains that is unique and denotes a new stage of artistic development, which cannot be shown to have existed in the great civilization of the East, especially in three branches, terra-cotta work, engraved stones, and gold work.[7]

The most important specimens of earliest art are the vases.[8] Of these some are painted, others plain. The former resemble the vessels found in northern Europe of the so-called prehistoric age, and are numerous in Troy, but less so at Mycenae. Of the painted vases, some have dull colours; and similar ones have been found in Assyria and Phoenicia. Those painted in varnish, which are plentiful at Mycenae, are found also in the east of Greece, in the islands, and here and there in the west. These vases are decorated with animals and plants of an order not highly developed; human figures seldom appear. This class of vessels is now called the Mycenaean. Mycenaean vases have been recently found at Athens, between the Pnyx and the Areopagus, in ancient tombs. Their origin and use are still unexplained. Connected with these are vessels with decorations consisting of geometrical figures, now called the Dipylon type. After them comes the so-called Oriental style, with its rosettes and fantastic figures of animals.[9]

The carved stones which belong to this period are now generally called island stones, because most of them are found in the islands of the Aegean, chiefly in those to the south-

ward, as Crete and Melos. But the name is not altogether appropriate, as the mainland, and particularly the Peloponnese, have yielded many specimens. They are akin to the oldest class of terra-cotta objects mentioned above, but exhibit many points of difference which distinctly indicate an Asiatic origin.

The numerous stamped gold plates form the most important part of the gold work discovered in Mycenae. They have partly stellated and similar patterns, partly cuttle-fish and butterflies, all very neatly executed. Besides these there are engravings in gold, but not all of the same character and style.[10] The gold cups of Vaphio are the flower of Mycenaean art.

We find, therefore, in Mycenae a number of works of art, which are in part found elsewhere in Greece, and which cannot be designated either as Asiatic or Egyptian. Recently a native origin has been strongly claimed for all this art, in the special sense that it is not of Semitic but of Indo-European character. This, however, is not proved.[11] The safest course is to say that it is a peculiar product of a stream of civilization flowing from Asia Minor, which perhaps had its source on the west coast of Asia, or perhaps in the islands of the Aegean, some of it perhaps in European Greece.

And why not some of it in Mycenae itself? That artists did work there is obvious; the lion relief over the gateway of Mycenae was not brought to Greece on board ship. That the wealthy rulers of Mycenae sent for artists from Asia is natural. The Asiatic origin of the walls of Tiryns is indicated by the tradition that they were built by Cyclopes from Lycia. But in order to imitate what these men had taught there was no need for people to come from Asia again. And if the architecture at Mycenae shows an advance on that of Tiryns, it may very easily have been accomplished by natives. The roof of the chamber of the treasure-house at Orchomenus is, it is true, an imitation of an Egyptian pattern, but we cannot believe that the slabs

were brought from Egypt to Greece; there must have been artists in Orchomenus itself, perhaps of Phoenician origin, or from Asia Minor. Many of the smaller objects also may therefore have been executed in Mycenae.

But at that time there were not only works of art more or less freely imitated from Oriental design in European Greece; an entirely new element was superadded. We recognize in the lions at Mycenae the realization of an artistic conception distinct from that which inspired Oriental artists. In these lions the spirit of routine has been avoided which in Assyria and Egypt led to an unnatural exaggeration of certain forms, in Assyria to give the idea of strength, and in Egypt to produce that of elegance. In the lions at Mycenae can be seen the beginning of a new art. And the treasuries at Mycenae, so far as we can judge, are also really new. Cone-shaped mounds over tombs were known in Asia, but in what part of Asia can be found such vaults as those of Orchomenus and Mycenae? And to attain to the conception of such vaults a long practice must have been necessary. Many gateways and many passages, perhaps also many buildings with converging roofs, must have been built before the idea of erecting those circular buildings was conceived. Perhaps the building on Mount Ocha in Euboea, which is supposed to be a Greek temple of great antiquity, belongs to this early stage of architecture. It is forty feet long, twenty-five feet broad, and the walls inside are eight feet high. The roof is formed by oblique layers of stones overlapping each other on the inside, which do not meet in the centre, but leave an opening eighteen feet long and one and a half broad, which forms a space in the building open to the sky. But from a building of this description to a treasure-house such as we find in Mycenae and Orchomenus is a great step. We must assume that the distance was first bridged over in Europe,[12] and then we have the proof of independent creations in art among the Greek peoples of that continent.

With a little imagination we can form a picture of the life of the princes and nobles in and around Mycenae and Orchomenus at the time when these cities were at their prime. Gigantic walls appear, of different periods, as the traveller sees by the more or less perfected style of building; in front of the gateways, scattered here and there, are the domes of the huge tombs of the royal family. On the plains can be seen youths and men practising chariot-racing. The houses of the rich are adorned with coloured stones, after Egyptian and Phoenician patterns, and in the rooms where the greatest luxury is to be displayed, with bronze plates. On festivals the men appear in the splendour of their arms, wearing swords richly inlaid with gold, rivalling the workmanship of the Renaissance; the women with beautifully-worked ornaments of gold on head, neck, and arms. At the banquets there were placed before the guests goblets of silver and gold just brought over by Phoenician sailors, or taken as booty by the warriors. The apartments of the women are adorned with costly trifles, here an ostrich egg with decorations of alabaster, there a casket of cedarwood containing carved stones, gold rings, and amber beads. Everywhere is seen the desire to add beauty and charm to life. Mycenae and Orchomenus imitate in their own way, and not without originality, Memphis and Babylon and Sidon and the palaces of Syria and Asia Minor.

NOTES

1. H. Schliemann, Ilios, Stadt und Land der Trojaner, Lpz. 1881; Troja, Ergebnisse meiner neuesten Ausgrabungen auf der Baustelle von Troja, Lpz. 1884; both works very fully illustrated. Cf. K. Schuchhardt, Schliemann's Ausgrabungen, 2 Aufl., Lpz. 1892. Schliemann was of opinion that only the citadel of Troy was upon the summit of Hissarlik, which he excavated, and that the town was farther below. His object was to be more consistent with Homer, who makes the town of Troy so much larger. Yet it is to be noticed that his line of argument is not conclusive (his reasons

are, in fact, merely as follows:—three gates to the citadel, a small piece of wall, which may be the beginning of a city wall, and *débris* beneath the citadel), and that, granting the existence of the lower city, the area given by Schliemann rests merely on grounds of expediency, not on traces of walls. The view of E. Bötticher (Ausland, 1883, n. 51-52) that the citadel was only a place for the cremation of corpses, has been convincingly refuted by Schliemann's colleague, W. Dörpfeld, Beil. z. Allgem. Ztg. 1884, Nr. 294. Moreover, a conference of archaeologists held in Troy itself has not led to a confirmation of Bötticher's views.

2. F. Lenormant, Découverte de constructions antéhistoriques dans l'île de Thérasia, Rev. Archéol. Nos. 14 and 16; F. Fouqué, Une Pompéi antéhistorique, Rev. des d. mondes, 83, p. 923. Also Mission scientifique à l'île de Santorin, Archives des missions, II. 1867. Fouqué places the catastrophe, which destroyed a part of the island and buried its earliest civilization, between 2000 and 1800 B.C. Cf. also Mamet, De ins. Thera, Par. 1871, with plates.

3. H. Schliemann, Mycenae, Bericht über meine Forschungen und Entdeckungen in Mykenae und Tiryns, Lpz. 1878; Steffen, Karten von Mykenai, Berl. 1884, two plates, with text by Steffen and Lolling; cf. also P. Gardner, New Chapters, Ch. iii.

4. H. Schliemann, Bericht über meine Ausgrabungen im boeotischen Orchomenos, Lpz. 1881.

5. Cf. Schliemann, Tiryns, Lpz. 1886; P. Gardner, New Chapters, Ch. iv.

6. Ulrich's Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland, I. 218, which Curtius quotes (G. G., I.[4], and note 46 to p. 78), has not proved it.

7. A. Milchhöfer, Die Anfänge der Kunst in Griechenland, Lpz. 1883; and, as a useful supplement and correction, O. Rossbach, Griechische Gemmen ältester Technik, Archäolog. Zeitung, 1883.

8. Dumont et Chaplain, Les céramiques de la Grèce propre, Paris, has remained unfinished. Chief work of reference: A. Furtwängler, Beschreibung der Vasensamml. im. Ant. d. Mus. zu Berlin, 2 Bde. 1885.—Helbig, Das Homerische Epos, p. 279, describes how, before the Dorian migration, two systems of decoration grew up side by side, "of which the one was geometrical in character, the other represented plant-like ornaments, and also lions, panthers, and fantastic forms of beasts."

9. The subject has been specially studied by Löschcke and Furtwängler. For a comprehensive work by the latter awaiting publication cf. the reports of the meeting of the Berlin Archaeo-

logical Society for July 1884, *e.g.* in the Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift, 1884, No. 42. Researches on this subject are in such an unfinished state, and go so much into detail, that a short *résumé* like the present is too much exposed to the twofold danger of getting out of date too soon, and, having regard to the nicety of the distinctions, of perhaps not even stating the last phase of the question with sufficient precision to render the author's meaning. The older vases may be divided into the following categories (Murray, Handbook of Greek Archaeology):—(1) Primitive types. (2) Mycenaean types (also in Ialysus, Spata, Menidi, Athens, Crete, Caria, Calymna, and elsewhere. Murray calls it "colonial pottery," p. 30). (3) Geometrical or diphylontic type, to which belongs the Phaleron class, Murray, 38. (4) Graeco-Asiatic vases, with rows of animals (Rhodes, Naucratis), M. 61. (5) Corinthian vases, M. 79.

10. If the two fighting men, an illustration of whom is given by Milchhöfer, p. 34, under No. 35, really date from the age before the Dorian migration, there must have been an idea even at that time of some of the principles of later Greek art, and its types of form must have been anticipated. The technique of the gold cups of Vaphio discovered by Tzuntas is, in Perrot's opinion, of native origin. Now, however, it is reported that Flinders Petrie has discovered a mural decoration in the same style as that of the gold cups in the palace of Chuenaten at Tel-el-Amarna. For the connection between Mycenaean and Egyptian art cf. P. Gardner, New Ch., p. 72 seq., and p. 85. The connection between Mycenaean art and Egypt is a criterion for deciding the question, to what period that art and the Mycenaean civilization belong. Chuenaten (XVIII. dyn.) lived about 1500 B.C. We may place the Mycenaean culture about 1600-1200 B.C. All this is, however, somewhat indefinite. Some scholars appear still to hold that this connection with Egypt does not prevent us from placing the Mycenaean art at a much later date. Cf. a discussion in the Athenaeum, 1892, between C. Torr and E. Gardner, also Murray's Handbook, p. 57. I am of the opinion that it is pre-Doric.

11. The analogy with the productions of Indian art discovered by Milchhöfer cannot, in our opinion, hold good, owing to the wide discrepancy of date. More to the point is his remark that the mixed figures with heads of horses, represented so largely in the island stones, do not appear in the country of the Euphrates nor in Egypt. But it is not altogether accurate. There is at least one example from the Euphrates (a winged horse from Nineveh, Perrot et Chipiez, II. Fig. 279). On the other hand, Milchhöfer's remark that the

horse plays an important part in Indian mythology is quite correct. This would certainly point to an Indo-European origin for this art. But compare the very apt remarks of Perrot, Hist. III. 601 seq., and besides important considerations of principle militate against the theory of an Aryan type of art. Milchhöfer tries to place the special development of this style of art in Crete. His reasons are the following:—many of the island stones have been discovered in Crete; the cuttlefish on the gold plates point to an art cultivated on the sea-coast; lastly, Crete was famous for its ancient practice of art. In opposition to this argument we remark as follows:—Crete is pre-eminently the home of Semitic influence (Europa, Talos, the Minotaur); therefore the existence of a specific Indo-European art in this island would have to be proved by very clear evidence. We might just as well select Rhodes, where more vases have been discovered, and where the Telchines lived, who, according to Diodorus, 5, 55, were artists in a higher sense than the Cretan Dactyli, who were rather artizans than artists. Moreover, it is not easy to see—and this is very important—what new element Crete, with its alleged devotion to and practice of art, could have added to those elements which, according to Milchhöfer himself, already existed in Indo-European art. Let us consider the following:—the gold plates with the cuttlefish were not found in Crete; gold itself is not found in Crete, but in Asia Minor; it is therefore more natural to assume that the gold articles were worked there. In that case the identity of the art and origin of the gold plates and the island stones is mere assumption, and scarcely probable, and if the gold plates with the cuttlefish do not originate in Crete, and there is no probability that they do so, they are of no value as proof that the entire art originated in Crete. Among the carved gold rings Milchhöfer discovers Cretan art in the one representing a woman under a tree. This ring, however, is not of better workmanship than the others, but worse, so that this specially Cretan product does not even present any advance upon the rest. There is thus no proof that Crete had more to do with this style of art than other countries. The style of the island stones and the large gold rings betrays a Babylonian origin, cf. the drawing of the cylinder by Hommel, Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens, Berl. 1885, p. 341. For the carved stones cf. Murray's Handbook. Further, Milchhöfer, in his essay on Schliemann in Westermann's Monatsheften 1891, November, does not lay stress on his Indo-European theory, but emphasizes the connection with Egypt.—Crude figures in limestone from the island of Ceros, Köhler, Mitth. d. d. arch. Inst. in Athen, 9, 2 Heft.

12. How far the rulers of Mycenae, etc., regarded themselves as foreigners we cannot say. The conjecture of U. Köhler is worthy of notice, that their civilization may have originated among the Carians. We saw (Chap. VII.) that there was an element in Greek civilization of admittedly Carian origin. But the Carian hypothesis has been successfully refuted by Percy Gardner, New Ch., p. 86.

CHAPTER IX

FOREIGN INFLUENCE ON GREECE. EGYPT, PHOENICIA

THE Greeks received the rudiments of their civilization from Asia and in part also from Egypt. The civilization of Asia Minor might have come to Greece direct, and without intermediaries, for they were in constant contact with the nations of that country; that of Assyria might also have been conveyed through the peoples of Asia Minor; but there was another route available, through Phoenicia. Egypt could hardly communicate with Greece except by means of the Phoenicians.

If certain facts in Egyptian history have been rightly interpreted, we should have much more to relate concerning the connection between Greece and Egypt; it is alleged that Greek races carried on war in Egypt even before 1200 B.C.[1]

Under King Seti I., at a time when his son Rameses II. was in reality ruler, Egypt was attacked by the Libyans and other allied nations called the Shardana and Tursha, who are believed to have been Sardinians and Tyrrhenians. But the relations of Greece and Egypt were closer in the great war, which Rameses II. had afterwards when on the throne to wage against the Khetas (Hittites), a powerful nation inhabiting the borders of Syria and Asia Minor. With the Khetas were united other races, the Dardana, Masu, Padasa, Jevanna, and Leka. The Dardana are said to be the Trojans or their kindred; according to some scholars the Jevanna were the

Ionians. Padasa reminds us of Pedasus, a town in the south of Asia Minor, Leka of the Lycians, Masu of the Mysians. If these interpretations are correct, we have here a great coalition of races of Asia Minor, some of them closely related to the Greeks. Under Menephta, the successor of Rameses II., fresh tribes from the north threatened Egypt, and were also repulsed. These were the Tursha, Shardana, and Leka, whom the Egyptians already knew, and the Shakalsha and Akaiwasha, the Sicels and Achaeans. This would make the name borne by the Greeks at the most brilliant period of their earliest history appear also in Egypt about the thirteenth century B.C. Under the most powerful king of the 20th dynasty, Rameses III., the nations of the north appear on the scene as invaders of Egypt for the last time, and with new names. The Tursha, Leka, and Shakalsha are joined by the Pulesta, Djakkaru, and Daunava. Are the Djakkaru the Teucrians, and the Daunava the Danaï? The latter supposition seems very probable. And perhaps the Danaï appeared even in the 18th dynasty, under Thothmes III., as enemies of Egypt, which would make their hostility last from about the fifteenth to the twelfth century B.C. But unfortunately all these interpretations of names are still contested and very problematical.[2]

And even if Greeks went to Egypt in those days, it is not possible that they learned the civilization of the Egyptians there, and then transplanted it into Greece. That must have been effected by other means. Many writers of the present day suppose that much was transmitted by the Khetas, who for a long period held a very important position in anterior Asia.[3] If, however, the Khetas did exercise an important influence on the Greeks, it is certain also that much must be ascribed to the Phoenicians.

It is not an easy task to describe the importance of the Phoenicians to Greece. Their general character is no doubt known through the long researches devoted to them. They were a nation of sea-traders with municipal autonomy, and in

this respect were the forerunners of the Greeks. They were Semitic in language and religion; in art they were dependent on others, especially on the Egyptians and the dwellers on the Euphrates; but they knew how to communicate their skill and knowledge to others. Even the Jews had experience of this latter quality. But no genuine remains of their civilization exist, like those of the Egyptians and Assyrians. Almost everything that comes from the Phoenicians is found, not in the small area of Phoenicia, but in other countries; it has therefore been subjected to foreign influence. Our knowledge of them consequently rests to a great extent on conjecture, and it is therefore difficult to distinguish what is of Phoenician origin even in Greece. Let us first consider what the ancients thought about the matter.

Their accounts of the settlements of the Phoenicians in Greek territory are mostly contained in the legend of Cadmus.[4] After Europa was carried off by Zeus, Agenor dispatched his sons Cadmus, Thasos, and Cilix in search of her. Cilix remained in Cilicia, Thasos on the island of that name. Cadmus went first to Crete, then to Rhodes, Thera, Melos, and Thrace. Here he opened the Pangaic mines. He then visited Delphi to inquire after the fate of Europa. The oracle advised him to give up further search, to follow a cow and settle where she should lie down. The spot was Thebes in Boeotia, and here a Phoenician colony was founded. At last he was driven from Thebes by Pentheus, and went to Illyria, which took its name from his son Illyrius,[5] and there died.

If we relied only on these accounts, we should not be justified in identifying these wanderings of Cadmus with the gradual settlements of Phoenicians upon Greek territory, for we do not know how much of them is arbitrary invention. If Cadmus died in Illyria and left a son Illyrius, that of itself cannot make us believe in the existence of a Phoenician colony in Illyria. Other traces of Phoenicians must be produced in the places which Cadmus is said to have visited,

before we can accept the settlement of Phoenicians there as a fact.

For the present, we may leave Crete on one side. Cadmus comes to Rhodes. Here it is said an indigenous people, of the race of the Heliadae, originally dwelt, who were conquered and reduced to submission by the Phoenicians.[6] The Phoenicians had later to submit to the Carians, and these in their turn to the Dorians. But when the Dorians landed on the island, they still found Phoenicians in the citadel of Ialysus, who were forced to capitulate by a stratagem. Even in later times, this Phoenician element in Ialysus was of importance, and was represented specially in the priestly families.

From Rhodes Cadmus went to Thera (Calliste), where he left Membliarus[7] with a few companions. But Phoenicians come to Thera in other ways. We have seen that when they came to Thera, the island had already contained a population which was annihilated by the collapse of the central peak of the volcano. According to Pausanias, Theras, who was descended from the stock of Cadmus, found Phoenicians in Thera 110 years after the Trojan War, and on that account settled there.

The island of Melos, not far from Thera, is said to have been a colony of the Phoenician town of Byblus.[8]

Cadmus proceeded from Thera to the north of the Aegean Sea, and landed at Samothrace and on the Thracian coast, while his brother took possession of Thasos. The existence of Phoenicians in Thasos was universally admitted in antiquity. Heracles was held in special honour there, and put on a level with the Tyrian god. The Phoenicians were induced to settle in Thasos by the quantity of gold on the island. Herodotus[9] speaks with admiration of the Phoenician gold mines there.

The occupation of Samothrace by the Phoenicians[10] may have left some traces in the worship of the Cabeiri practised there. No Phoenician remains have been found on the Thracian coast. As, however, the legends assert that Cadmus opened

the mines of Pangaeus,[11] we are justified in holding that the Phoenicians had a colony there.

Now we come to the settlement in Thebes. But first we will refer to other traces of the presence of Phoenicians in Greece. Two points of view must be considered here. Where the name of a place or religious forms of worship indicate the probability of Phoenician origin, there Phoenicians have probably settled. But great caution is necessary, for we cannot argue the existence of a colony of a people from every point of resemblance to its worship. And further, we must not overlook the fact that everything in Greece of a Semitic character does not necessarily originate with Phoenicians settled there.

Everything bears out the supposition that the island of Cythera, which lies to the south of Laconia, was a Phoenician colony. That the ancients themselves believed it, is shown by the representation of Cytherus as the son of Phoenix.[12] The chief deity of the island was Aphrodite, whose worship spread from here in every direction. And we know why the Phoenicians colonized Cythera. In the sea around the island the purple shell-fish required by the Phoenicians for their dyes were found in abundance. Vast heaps of the shells of the *Murex brandaris* in Cythera and on the neighbouring Laconian coast near Gytheium, demonstrate to this day the importance of that sea to Phoenician industry. Besides this, Cythera was conveniently situated in the track of vessels sailing to and from the west.

Thucydides says that many of the islands of the Aegean were inhabited by Phoenicians.[13] And besides those enumerated above, some others can be mentioned which contain special traces of them. They probably occupied the islands of Nisyros, Cos, and Gyaros, because the purple shell-fish were found there. They probably were the first to work the mines in Siphnos, and just as they introduced the art of weaving into Thera, so the stuffs of Cos and Amorgos may certainly be referred to Phoenician industry.[14]

But what is the position as regards Phoenician settlements on the mainland of Greece? Here we have only names and worships to guide us. In Laconia the worship of Aphrodite and the feast of Hyacinthia were of great importance. Hyacinthus has some resemblance to Adonis, and in this we can see evidence of Phoenician influence. It is true that to prove this it is not necessary for the Phoenicians to have settled on the mainland. But we must assume a settlement of Phoenicians on the isthmus of Corinth, both on account of the worship of Aphrodite and Melicertes (Melkarth) and the commercial advantages offered by the occupation of the isthmus. The name of the little island of Minoa, close to Megara, supports the theory of a Phoenician colony there, and still more does the name of Salamis.[15] On the mainland of Attica, a few names make Phoenician colonization not improbable, although it is not proved. Melite, a quarter of the city of Athens, has the same name as the well-known island (Malta), which was in the possession of the Phoenicians. Marathon has likewise a Phoenician sound. Another reason in the case of Marathon is the local worship of Heracles, who might have been Melkarth here.[16] The Phoenicians are said to have come from Euboea to Marathon, which is supposed to have been occupied by comrades of Cadmus. Euboea is said to have borne the names Macris and Porphyra at one time, and Macris is interpreted as a corruption of Melkarth, while Porphyra points to the purply dye made by the Phoenicians. Even Styra, which was the name of a Euboean town, is said to refer to Astarte, and so point to Phoenician colonists. Hence it is probable that the Phoenicians settled in Euboea, and if this is credited, a settlement in Thebes is also not improbable.

Thebes lies in a fertile district, on a hill to the south of the Copaic Lake. A neighbouring chain of hills bore the name Phoenicium, while the citadel has always had the name Cadmeia. The streams Dirce and Ismenus flow round the city; the latter name is supposed to be a corruption of Eshmun, a

Phoenician god. Not far from Thebes is a shrine of the Cabeiri, perhaps Phoenician deities. Heracles is a native of Thebes, and in that case may be the same as Melkarth. Even the number and names of the gates of Thebes have been quoted as indicating Semitic origin.[17] The seven gates of Thebes were probably dedicated to the seven planets and their respective gods. The legendary history of Thebes can easily be explained in the light of a long struggle between the Phoenicians and the original inhabitants. Cadmus is succeeded by the native Pentheus, then the Cadmeian Polydorus, then their opponent Nycteus. After him comes Labdacus, son of Polydorus, and then natives again, Lycus and the Lycidae, Amphion and Lethus. Then follows the Labdacid Laius.[18]

The existence of a Phoenician colony in Thebes is accordingly not improbable, and yet the theory is confronted by an intrinsic difficulty. How was it that the Phoenicians, who were merchants in the first place, and manufacturers in a secondary degree, came to settle in the interior, at a distance from the sea? In all other places where they settled the attraction is obvious. Here it was the fishing, there the mines, or commerce. Only the last named could have applied in the case of Thebes. But was it necessary to go so far from the coast? One explanation of this striking fact might be that the bulk of the settlers in Thebes were not Phoenicians but an agricultural people of Semitic origin, perhaps Canaanites, who found in fertile Boeotia the soil of which they were in search.[19] Yet we must bear in mind that Thebes has a commanding position between north and south Boeotia and the eastern and western seas, and on that account might be, like Corinth, of importance to a people in possession of the Euripus and desirous of trading in the direction of the Corinthian Gulf. This circumstance has hitherto not been sufficiently taken into consideration.[20] We do not admit the improbability of a Phoenician colony in Thebes.

Much that was new was, according to the opinion of the

Greeks, introduced into Greece by Cadmus, that is, by the Phoenicians: the worship of Dionysus,[21] mining, quarrying stone,[22] and, above all, the use of the alphabet. In reference to this last point some distinctions must be made. The Greek characters cannot be proved to have existed before the eighth century B.C. They first appear in Crete. If they are a modification of the Phoenician characters, the change must have taken place some time before the eighth century B.C. At that time a long period had elapsed since the Phoenicians first came to Greece and brought their own alphabet with them. Hence the legend respecting the introduction of the alphabet into Greece by Cadmus contains two elements of probability, viz., that the Phoenicians at some time or other used their alphabet in Greece, and that the Greeks subsequently formed their own alphabet from that of the Phoenicians.

In the foregoing remarks certain forms of worship in Greece have been assumed, as a matter of course, to be of Phoenician origin. The assumption is fully justified as regards Aphrodite, who is undoubtedly of Asiatic descent;[23] and Heracles, as we have taken for granted, can often be traced to Melkarth. If the Phoenicians were the first to bring wine in considerable quantities to the Greeks, then the relations of Dionysus to Thebes would be explicable in this way. Again, it is not improbable that the figure of Ares was modified by the Phoenicians. Ares and Harmonia in Thebes correspond to the chief male and female deities of the Phoenicians. A Phoenician element has been introduced even into the worship of Zeus. Between Orchomenus and Coroneia, and also in Iolcus in Thessaly, human sacrifices were at one time offered to Zeus Laphystius. This recalls the human sacrifices, especially of children, required by the Phoenician god.

And now we have to deal with a piece of Greek territory which experienced Phoenician influence in a marked degree,

viz. Crete.[24] Zeus carried off Europa from Phoenicia to Crete; his son is Minos. The legends relating to Minos exhibit many Phoenician characteristics. A bull brought Europa to Crete; a bull begot the Minotaur, the man with a bull's head, who required human sacrifice, which was offered by the Athenians to the number of seven, sacred to the Semites. It is clear that this repeated appearance of the bull in the Cretan myths points to Phoenician influence. Many names of places in Crete are plainly of Phoenician origin. We must assume that the great reputation for wisdom, which Minos enjoyed in the Greek legends, rested on the fact that a peculiar civilization prevailed in Crete, which was promoted by the inventions and forms of worship borrowed from the Phoenicians. The same peculiar civilization has expressed itself in their art, the representatives of which are the Idaean Dactyli and Daedalus. We have seen that Greek art received its impulse and models from Asia; to what extent Daedalus may contain a Phoenician or general Asiatic element cannot now be determined.[25]

The ancients were generally more correct than many of the moderns in their estimate of the influence of the Phoenicians upon Greece. The Phoenicians had trading settlements at many points on the coast; the Greeks learnt much from them, but, with the exception of the alphabet, nothing of great importance.

NOTES

1. For the supposed presence of Achaeans, etc. in Egypt, cf. E. Meyer, G. d. Alt., §§ 194, 234, 260, 263, 264, who believes in the supremacy which Egypt in the fifteenth century exercised over the "Greek islands," and in the expedition of the Danai to Egypt in the twelfth century. In opposition to De Rougé and Chabas, Wiedemann, and to a certain extent Brugsch, contest the identity of this maritime people with the Greeks. It is possible that among these peoples there were none who dwelt in Europe. The most thorough investigation of all these questions is that by W. M.

Müller in his book quoted above (VII. n. 12), especially his chapters 27 and 28.

2. The Daunava were enemies of Egypt as early as the reign of Thothmes III., Maspero, H. d. l'anc. Or., 287 ; Fr. Lenormant identifies the league of the nations of the Mediterranean against Rameses III. with the Cretan thalassocracy ; both embrace Sicily ; Anfänge d. Kultur, II. 296-298.

3. For the Hittites, A. H. Sayce, The Monuments of the Hittites, in the Transactions of the Soc. of Bibl. Archaeol., VII. 2 (1881) ; Ancient Empires of the East, Herodotus, I.-III., Lond. 1883 ; E. Meyer, G. d. A., §§ 230 seq., 250-258, 263-266 ; W. Wright, The Empire of the Hittites, Lond. 1884. The excessive importance now assigned to the Khetas or Hittites is much reduced by Müller, chap. 25 of his work.

4. For the Phoenicians in Greece : cf. Movers, Phönicier, and Fr. Lenormant in his Premières civilisations, Vol. II., pp. 223-309. Phoenician life as a whole has lately been connectedly and cleverly treated by Perrot, in Perrot et Chipiez, Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité, Vol. III., Par. 1885.

5. Illyrius, son of Cadmus, Apollod. 3, 5, 4. But we must take into consideration here the collection of materials made by E. Oberhummer, Phoenicier in Acarnanien, München, 1882.

6. For Rhodes, cf. Conon, Narr., 47 ; Ergias, quoted in Athen. 8, 360 seq. ; Diod. 5, 58.—Excavations in Rhodes, especially in Cameirus and Ialysus, by Salzmann ; the results are partly in the British Museum.

7. For Thera, Paus. 3, 1, 7, 8 : Membliarus is the son of Poiciles. Synkell, 299, places the Phoenician settlement in Thera in the fifteenth century B.C.; cf. St. Byz.: Ἀνάφη and Μεμβλίαρος. For the ancient Phoenician graves in Thera at Cape Culumbus, cf. Lenormant, 2, 249.

8. For Melos, St. Byz. Μῆλος.

9. For Thasos, Herod. 6, 47, and 2, 44.

10. Samothrace, Diod. 5, 48.

11. The gold mines of Pangaeus, Kallisth., quoted in Strabo, 14, 680 ; Plin. 7, 197.

12. For Cythera, St. Byz. Κύθηρα ; Hes., Theog., 192. Acc. to Thuc. 4, 53, we find commerce carried on between Cythera and Egypt and Libya as early as 424 B.C.

13. Phoenicians on the islands of the Aegean, Thuc. 1, 8.

14. For Cos and Amorgos, Lenormant, 2, 262.

15. On the little island of Hagios Georgios between Salamis and Attica, Sp. Lampros has found heaps of *Murex trunculus*, cf. Σ. Λάμπρου Ἱστορικὰ μελήματα, Ἀθ. 1884, p. 26 seq.

16. While modern writers in general accept the presence of Phoenicians in Attica, and especially in Athens (even C. Wachsmuth, Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum, I., Lpz. 1874), U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf (Aus Kydathen) contests it. Arabians with Cadmus in Euboea, Str. 10, 447.

17. J. Brandis, Die Bedeutung der sieben Thore Thebens, in the Hermes, Bd. II.

18. Struggle of Hellenism and Orientalism expressed in the Theban myths, Lenormant, Premières civilisations, 2, 285.

19. Settlement of agricultural Canaanites, retreating before Israelitish incursion (sixteenth century) into Canaan, in Boeotia, acc. to Lenormant, Prem. civil. 2, 298.

20. Ephorus, quoted in Strabo, 9, 614, has emphasized the fact that Boeotia alone is τριθάλαττος.

21. Worship of Dionysus by the Phoenicians, Herod. 2, 49.

22. Quarrying stone Phoenician, Plin. 7, 195. Working of stone originated with the Phoenicians in the sense that they taught the art of building stone houses and of turning mountain sides into terraces, which was of the greatest importance for Phoenicia itself. There they hollowed houses and fortresses out of the solid rock. At the same time we must not overlook the fact that a similar use of rock and stone generally was, according to legend and ocular testimony, peculiar to the Lycians, whose influence upon Greece is acknowledged. Did the Lycians also learn from the Phoenicians? Probably not. We must conclude that the influence of Phoenicia on Greece in this respect is problematical.

23. Cf. F. Hommel, Aphrodite—Astarte, N. Jahrb. f. Phil., 1882. Ashtoret: Aftoret: Afrotet.

24. For Crete, Hoeck, Creta, 3 Bde., Gött. 1823-1829. Of later travels, Pashley, 2 vols., Camb. and Lond. 1837; Spratt, 2 vols., Lond. 1867; Perrot, L'île d. Crète, Par. 1867.

25. The determination of the date of the Phoenician settlements in Greece has been lately discussed by Duncker, Geschichte des Alterthums, 2, 41, 42. But everything connected with the subject is very vague; we cannot even be certain about centuries. Of late a decided reaction has set in against the popular theory of the great influence exercised by the Phoenicians on Greece, which is perfectly justifiable, but is not always to the point. The real reason why people contest the existence of Phoenician settlements in Greece is that they object to make the Greeks indebted to Phoenicia for anything of importance. We believe we have proved that the widespread influence ascribed to them, which strangely enough is admitted even by the opponents

of Semiticism, originates solely in caprice. But why should there be a reluctance to admit the existence of mere settlements of Phoenicians in Greece, when supported by historical criteria which are considered valid in other cases? Phoenicians were once there, but their influence was inconsiderable. Cf. also R. VON SCALA, Ueber die wichtigsten Beziehungen des Orients zum Occid. im Alterthum, Vienna, 1886. FLINDERS PETRIE, by his excavations and writings, has lately contributed much to our knowledge of the earliest relations between Greece and Egypt; cf. his "Ten Years' Digging in Egypt," Lond. 1892, at the conclusion of which are given the records of his special work. Chapter xi. of the book, entitled Fresh Light on the Past, is of great interest for the whole of ancient history. In it he states that, in his opinion, "Europe has an indigenous civilization as independent of Egypt and Babylonia as was the indigenous Aryan civilization of India." It is "at one with the culture of the Bronze Age, of which it is the crown and flower. Across Europe, from the Greek peninsula to the Baltic, this civilization stretches." It exerted an influence even upon ancient Egypt. More time and further research will be needed to appreciate these important ideas and estimate the full signification and bearing of them.

CHAPTER X

THE MOST IMPORTANT LEGENDS OF GREECE

The life of the earliest Greeks is mirrored in their legends. Not that historical facts can be deduced from them, but their genuine portions reflect the mind of the people, and make us acquainted with the chief centres of civilization. No doubt it is difficult to pick out what is genuine. As a matter of course all personifications of abstract ideas and of whole races must be omitted; but many other details are also arbitrary inventions. In our opinion only those legendary personages are genuine whose deeds or sufferings have something remarkable about them. And here begins the element which, running through the whole of Greek history, forms its principal charm, and constitutes the main title to superiority of the Greek nation—the prominence of individuality. These individuals are at first only creations of popular legends, and do not become historical personages until later. In the realm of art the individualizing instinct of the Greeks displayed itself especially in sculpture, and in literature in the drama. Dramatic poetry has materially contributed to the more perfect development of the individuality of the ancient heroes.

The three countries of Greece most important in legendary history are Argolis, Boeotia, and Thessaly. In Argolis nothing worthy of mention is recorded until the coming of Io, who, in the course of her wide wanderings, journeys as far as Egypt. But Io herself has nothing peculiarly Argive about her, she is

rather a figure of religious history than of genuine legend. She is a goddess, and it is not impossible, in spite of all that has been said to the contrary, that she indicates a connection between Egypt and Argolis. Her grandsons are Aegyptus and Danaus, and with the daughters of Danaus, the Danaidae, we enter the sphere of local legend. It has been generally admitted that the Danaidae represent the aspect of nature in Argolis, the porous soil of which required constant watering to make it fertile. From the Egyptian Lynceus and the Danaid Hypermnestra the succeeding kings of Argos are descended through their grandsons Acrisius and Proitus. And now we come to those heroes who are really gods, being manifestations of the sun-god, but who in their character of mortals undergo hard struggles with divine assistance and, after suffering ill-treatment and pain themselves, render service to mankind by destroying monsters and robbers. To this class belong Bellerophon, who is persecuted by Proitus and slays the Chimaera with the aid of the winged horse Pegasus; Perseus, whose mother Danae was left on the open sea in a chest, and who had to fight the Gorgon and other monsters; and finally, Heracles himself, who was obliged to serve Eurystheus and at the same time labours for the benefit of mankind. He is the prototype of the valiant hero always rewarded with ingratitude, and this characteristic, added to those of his original, the Phoenician god, completes the type. Of these three heroes, two, Bellerophon and Heracles, have but a slight connection with Argolis. In Greece Bellerophon is mostly identified with Corinth, Heracles with Thebes. The connection of Heracles with Argos dates from a time when the Dorians were endeavouring to find a mythical justification for their occupation of the Peloponnese. On the other hand, the reigns of Proitus, Acrisius, and their successors derive importance from the prominence now given in the legends to the architectural history of the country. Proitus is said to have built the walls

of Tiryns with the aid of Cyclopes from Lycia. In the age immediately following, the descendants of Acrisius, Perseus and the Perseidae, and not those of Proitus, ruled in Tiryns. The explanation is that Perseus, who was to have ruled in Argos, the city of Acrisius, could not bear taking over the kingdom of the grandfather whom he had murdered; he therefore makes over Argos to the Proitidae and takes Tiryns for himself. This explanation of the alleged exchange is perhaps rather a clumsy one. But Acrisius himself is only a makeshift, and some such personage was supposed to be necessary, for Proitus was said to have built the walls of Tiryns, and yet Perseus, who was not a descendant of Proitus, afterwards ruled there. The story of Acrisius and the exchange was invented in order to connect all these legendary fragments. With Perseus we advance a step further in history. He builds the walls of Mycenae; and the legend in giving these walls a later date than those of Tiryns, follows what we learn from their appearance. From this time Mycenae becomes the most important place in Argolis, and the family of Perseus is continued there. After unimportant intervals come Amphitryon, Alcmene, and Eurystheus, all Perseidae, which brings us to the greatest of all heroes, Heracles. His exploits, which embrace the whole of Greece, cannot be described here. The important facts for Argolis are that the Perseidae soon disappear, and that the Pelopidae become masters of part of the country in their place. The mode in which the Pelopidae are connected genealogically with the Perseidae, and the explanation of their displacing the latter, are no evidence of the truth. It was considered necessary to explain in some way or other how Agamemnon, who was not descended from Perseus, and whose family more probably came from Asia Minor, attained to power in Mycenae, and for this purpose complicated stories bearing an air of plausibility were invented. How much of the early history of the Atreidae rests upon ancient legend and how much of

it is later embellishment, we cannot ascertain. The horrible crimes attributed to Atreus and Thyestes may be mere invention, but that Atreus comes through Pelops from Asia Minor is certainly ancient tradition.

At what time and by whom can the name "Isle of Pelops" have been given to the Peloponnese?[1] Certainly not by the Dorians, who were the very people that drove out the Pelopidae. It points to the whole peninsula as belonging to Pelops, and yet the legend makes no mention of so important a fact. If Pelops was not the ruler of the whole country, he must in some way or other have exercised a great influence over it; it must have been supposed that he introduced some important novelty. We may conjecture that the race which he represents introduced the use of the light chariot from Asia. Chariots and charioteers are depicted on the grave slabs at Mycenae. The legend relates that Pelops defeated King Oenomaus of Pisa in a chariot race. The district of the lower Alpheius must have had an important share in the spread of the fame of Pelops.

But the Pelopidae belong especially to Mycenae. The city of Argos, brought by its position into marked rivalry with Mycenae, had entirely different rulers in the time of the Pelopidae. Adrastus was king in Argos during the wars with Thebes, and when Agamemnon bore sway over Mycenae and many other districts and islands, Diomedes, the son of Tydeus, reigned there. Nauplia is an Argolic city, which must have been of importance in ancient times. Its origin is uncertain. It is seldom mentioned in the legends, but Palamedes is clearly a native of it; it was perhaps a Dryopian city in early times, and the inventive character ascribed to Palamedes makes it possible that Phoenicians lived there in remote ages. An important district of Argolis is the mountainous promontory to the east called Acte, off which lies the island of Calauria. Here Poseidon is king, while Asclepius rules over the neighbouring Epidaurus. The Attic Acte lies opposite the Argolic

Acte. Nature seems to have destined them for mutual intercourse. And in the legends, close relations exist between Athens and Troizene, to both of which Poseidon and Theseus belong. The Saronic Gulf is Ionian. The naval confederacy of Calauria extends somewhat farther. The intimate relations between the localities on the Saronic Gulf were, however, impaired by the circumstance that the Isthmus, over which ran a trading route of great importance, was in the background. Thus the Gulf was traversed chiefly by ships bound for the Isthmus, and it became an important centre of trade while the intercourse between the two Actes diminished. Troizene, however, was friendly to Athens at the time of the Persian War.

The next country of importance in Greek legendary history is Boeotia. In this low-lying land we find two capitals which flourished independently of each other — Orchomenus and Thebes. It is difficult to say how two such famous and powerful communities came to flourish in close proximity to each other in this inland district. The two cities stand in much the same relation to one another as Mycenae and Argos. Orchomenus and Thebes are, like them, rivals; Mycenae, like Orchomenus, was only of importance in the earliest ages, and they resemble each other in the fact that our interest in them is due to their ancient architecture, which testifies to great wealth. While the legends concerning Mycenae are very numerous, with Orchomenus the case is different. What do we know of the history of the wealthy rulers of this city? Minyas and Orchomenus are mentioned as the richest of them. These names are enough to show that tradition has nothing to say about them; they are only eponyms. The genuine legends of the country are connected with forms of worship which have little or nothing to do with the historical position of Orchomenus. These are the worship of Zeus Laphystius, of which we shall speak in connection with Thessaly, and the worship and oracle of Trophonius at

Lebadeia. Orchomenus itself was famous as the home of the Charites, Thallo and Auxo, the nymphs of growth and beauty. The power of Orchomenus was destroyed by Thebes, it is said under the leadership of Heracles. It is certain that the importance of Orchomenus was derived from its agriculture, and we may suppose that a rise of the waters of the Copaic Lake diminished the productivity of the soil and consequently the wealth of Orchomenus. This lake has natural outlets, and even in early times attempts were made to regulate them and keep them open; besides, the shafts which are found there show that an endeavour was made to construct an artificial outlet, but it was never completed. But Orchomenus must also have known something of navigation, or it would not have been a member of the Calaurian amphictyony. Its harbour was Larymna. We have already noted the intimate intercourse between Orchomenus and the south of Thessaly; and in fact, the voyage through the Euripus is not a long one. Panopeus, which lies west of Orchomenus immediately beyond the Phocian border line, was the home of the Phlegyae, who were akin to the Minyae, and were notorious for their irreligion, forming in this respect a decided contrast to the neighbouring Delphi. In the south-west of Boeotia rises Mount Helicon, clothed with forest and abounding in springs, and also the home of the Muses, originally divinities of the springs, whose worship spread from Thrace to Boeotia. The south-east of Boeotia comes within the sphere of influence of Thebes. Here the original inhabitants fought with foreign invaders, the descendants of Cadmus with the descendants of the Sparti sprung from the dragon's teeth. The native religious element is represented by Zethus and Amphion, the Theban Dioscuri. Semele, the mother of Bacchus, is the daughter of Cadmus. Boeotia always remained the chief home of the bacchanalian worship of the wine-god, who, according to the assertions of the Greeks, came to Greece from the north by way of Thrace. We need not relate the well-known legend of Oedipus here;

it is sufficient to note that the figure of the Sphinx which appears in it proves that this legend too was permeated by Oriental ideas. If there is any truth in the account of the war of the Seven against Thebes, it must have been a struggle between Thebes and Sicyon, which was the home of Adrastus. Connections between towns on either side of the Corinthian Gulf are very natural. They form a counterpart to what we have said of the coasts of the Saronic Gulf; before the Peloponnese fell under Dorian influence, the sea maintained its importance as a high road and a connecting link. The mythical representative of the earliest intercourse between the shores of the Corinthian Gulf (of which the most important place is Sicyon), and further, by way of Corinth, in the direction of Aegina and Salamis, and through Boeotia towards Chalcis, is the river-god Asopus, who possesses marked importance in mythical genealogies, corresponding somewhat to that which the Achelous has for forms of worship.

The third country especially rich in legends is Thessaly. The Thessalian heroes are descendants of Aeolus; their chief divinity is Poseidon. We pass over their pedigree, and proceed to consider only their prominent figures. First comes Admetus, king of Phera, served by Apollo as shepherd, for whom his wife Alcestis sacrificed herself to save him from death. Next comes Pelias, king of Iolcus, whose hatred of Jason led to the Argonautic expedition. When Pelias commands him to fetch the Golden Fleece, he does what happens over and over again in legends and fairy stories. If a person wishes to get rid of another without exactly killing him, he gives him a task, in the execution of which he must lose his life. We will refer to the voyage of the Argo later on. After the termination of it comes the bit of fairy story in which the daughters of Pelias boil their father, on the advice of the cunning Medea, in order to make him young again, a variation of the tale of the bath which renews youth. The town of Halus in Phthiotis belongs to Athamas, who, however, has also a home at Orcho-

menus in Boeotia. His history illustrates the popular conception of the wicked stepmother. Athamas repudiates his wife Nephele and marries Ino, who persecutes her stepchildren Phrixus and Hella. Phrixus is about to be sacrificed when he is saved by Nephele. He and Hella escape on the Golden Ram to Colchis, but Hella is drowned and so gives a name to the straits between Europe and Asia. But retribution is at hand. Ino, pursued by the maddened Athamas, throws herself into the sea, where she becomes the goddess Leucothea. Her son Melicertes perishes, but is worshipped on the Isthmus of Corinth under the name of Palaemon. Divine honours were paid to Athamas in Halus, but nevertheless a curse rested upon his descendants who settled there. They could not enter the Prytaneum or they might be slain in honour of Zeus Laphystius. The sacrifice of Phrixus is said to have taken place according to the Boeotian legend on Mount Laphystius near Coronea. Another connecting link between Halus and Coronea exists in the fact that Athene Itonia was worshipped in Iton near Italus as well as Coronea. The myths of the Centaurs and Lapithae also belong to Thessaly. The latter are fabulous monsters of the mountain forest, one of whom, Cheiron, becomes a wise physician, through the use of its healing herbs. The former are said to have had their home around Gyrton and Elatea on the lower Peneius. The mountains of Pelion, Ossa, and Olympus, so famous in legend, are also in Thessaly. The cloud-girt peak of Olympus was the home of the gods in the eyes of the inhabitants of the plain of the Peneius. The legend of Achilles also belongs to Thessaly. It is true that his father Peleus was said to be son of Aeacus and brother of Telamon, which would make Achilles come from Aegina. But he has in reality nothing to do with Aegina, and his derivation from that place is only a proof of the arbitrary methods of the genealogists. The name Peleus, as also that of Pelias, points to the proximity of Mount Pelion and Thessaly. When Achilles and Ajax were made cousins,

it was necessary to explain that Peleus came from Aegina to Thessaly. A favourite method of bringing a hero from a place with which he is unconnected to the place to which he belongs is banishment.[2] And so Peleus must go into banishment, the reason alleged being that he has slain his brother Phocus. By his marriage with a woman descended from Myrmidon, Peleus becomes king of a part of Phthiotis, while a marriage with Thetis makes him father of Achilles. We must not forget that those parts of Thessaly which are in proximity to central Greece and the sea are most prominent in the legends. The Lapithae live more on the extreme boundary, and so are credited with a semi-barbarous character.[3] The other Greek districts have not such a wealth of legend as Argos, Boeotia, and Thessaly. In the mercantile city of Corinth we find Sisyphus afterwards quoted as the type of cunning, from whom the no less cunning Odysseus is for that reason made to descend. The last fortunes of Medea also refer to Corinth. Bellerophon also belongs to it by birth, and for this reason the Corinthians stamped Pegasus upon their coins. We have already seen that the history of Athamas is brought to a conclusion in the neighbourhood of Corinth. The small extent of Corinthian territory and the wide range of its commerce explain the connection of Corinthian legends with foreign countries.

In the Attic legends there is much that is artificial. After Athens became famous, poets and prose writers vied with each other in exaggerating and embellishing the local legends. This is made particularly evident by the fact that the humanity and refinement which were characteristic of the later Athenians, are introduced in a marked degree in the earliest legends.[4] We may consider much in these legends valuable from a poetical point of view, and yet be of opinion that they contain little which adds to our knowledge of the early history of Attica or of her ancient civilization.

In the earliest times Attica had two political centres—

Athens and Eleusis. Around Eleusis spreads one of those unfertile plains which are peculiar to this part of Greece. The legend of Demeter belongs to Eleusis, while in Athens, with the exception of Erechtheus, the snake-footed Cecrops, the daughters of Pandion, Procne and Philomela, and a few others, there are no important and decidedly national legends until the appearance of Theseus. This makes him one of the most interesting personages in Greek legend; but unfortunately much even of him is the product of artificial arrangement, partly to enhance the importance of Athens, partly in imitation of the wonderful adventures of Heracles. His birth alone is such that he appears more as a god than as a member of a royal Attic family. His father, Aegeus, is merely the counterpart of Poseidon. Of the details of his history, the struggle with the Amazons deserves special attention, who are said to have forced their way as far as Attica, and then to have been defeated by him there. If this legend has any foundation in fact it must be that certain Oriental forms of worship which had penetrated into Attica were unable to maintain their position there. The connection of Theseus with Crete may be explained in a similar manner. Daedalus, who performed such wonders in Crete, is said to have come originally from Attica. When we consider that Athens displayed no considerable artistic activity in the earliest times, we may conjecture that in this case also the necessity of glorifying Athens has interfered to distort the legend. Towards the end of the heroic age the Neleidae appear as rulers in place of the Theseidae, but no one can say how much truth there is in the story that this family came from the Peloponnese. One of the most important facts of Greek history is the close connection of Attica, and especially the city of Athens, with the goddess Athene, which is closer than that of any other god with a Greek city. But only the fact is known. It is impossible to deduce from it any further conclusions respecting the development of the worship of the goddess, nor about the earliest history of Athens. Athene,

the legend runs, strove with Poseidon for Attica, and won it. This legend certainly contains a historical event. We have seen that Poseidon was especially worshipped round the Saronic Gulf, that Theseus was really looked upon as a son of Poseidon, and we know that Athene was the special goddess of Athens. We may conclude from this that the worshippers of Poseidon in Attica were conquered by the worshippers of Athene, but what name should be given to the conquerors and the conquered we cannot say. The conquered race might have been Ionians, but who then were the people who brought with them the worship of Athene? Does the worship of Athene in the Troad, in Thessaly and in Boeotia offer any ground for historical combinations? Moreover, in the history of Attica there are no traces of a distinction between a conquered and conquering race. Pittheus of Troizene, father of Aethra, is son of Pelops: are the Ionians and Pelopidae then identical in a certain sense? The past seems to loom through a veil of mist which will always obscure its real outline.

Aegina plays a not unimportant part in the heroic genealogies. Patroclus was descended from this nymph, who was a daughter of Asopus, the river-god of Sicyon, by a mortal father through an intermediate generation; but Zeus was the father of her son Aeacus, the most pious of men, for whom were created the Myrmidons out of ants. The sons of Aeacus, Peleus and Telamon, unlike their father in character, slew their brother and had to flee on account of their crime. Telamon obtained Salamis, and became the father of Ajax and Teucer, the latter of whom founded Salamis in Cyprus. Peleus went to Thessaly. The fortunes of Achilles and Neoptolemus cannot of course be related here, but it is worthy of notice that the later kings of the Molossians, that is, the family of the famous Pyrrhus of Epirus, claimed descent from the son of Neoptolemus.

Laconia and Messenia are the home of the legend of Leda. It is true that Leda was said to have come from Calydon,

where Tyndareus, after being driven out of Laconia, married her. But we are familiar with these expedients of the genealogists. The children of Leda are the Dioscuri or Tyndaridae, Castor and Pollux, who were originally purely divine personalities, and interfered in various ways in the fates of mankind. Under this name they are peculiarly Laconian deities. In Messenia another twin pair corresponds to them, Idas and Lynceus, who were slain by Castor and Pollux—an antedating of the historical struggle between Laconia and Messenia and of the issue of the Messenian wars. The daughters of Leda are Clytemnestra and the famous Helen, who also was originally a goddess. Next to Laconia we take the neighbouring Arcadia. Of the Arcadian communities Tegea stood in close relationship to Sparta, which is expressed in the legend by Timandra, a daughter of Tyndareus, marrying King Echemus of Tegea. In Arcadia there is a marked endeavour to bring the numerous towns and districts into close connection with one another by means of genealogies, and so prove the original unity of the country. But we cannot attach any weight to these myths, which often contradict each other. On the other hand, many of the figures of the Arcadian legends are not wanting in poetic interest. To Arcadia belongs Telephus, the son of Heracles, who was wounded and healed by the spear of Achilles. The god Pan harmonizes admirably with the mountain scenery of Arcadia, and so does the Styx, which discharges its icy stream from the precipices of the Aroania range by a lofty fall into the valley. The divine ruler of Arcadia is Zeus.

In the south-west of Arcadia lies Pylos, rendered famous by the gray-haired Nestor, who, as descendant of Neleus, really comes from Thessaly. His descendants settled in Athens, and there became kings and leaders of the Ionic colonization of Asia Minor.

The legends of Elis, according to the theory of the genealogists, are an offshoot from those of Thessaly through

Aethlius, who came from Thessaly to Elis. This name was naturally first invented when the Olympian games began to be famous. Among other eponymous heroes appearing in the Elean genealogies, who are neither of historical nor legendary interest, is an Aetolus, who, when exiled for the usual reason, *i.e.* a murder committed by him, crossed the Gulf, and as ruler of the Curetes gave them the name Aetolians. In Elis reigned Augeias, whose stables Heracles cleansed by making the river Alpheius run through them, whereupon he founded the Olympian games in commemoration of the exploit. The constant rival of Elis is Pisatis. This district too lays claim to the foundation of the Olympian games, and here Pelops suggests the idea by defeating Oenomaus in the chariot-race and so winning his daughter Hippodamia.

The multiplication of eponymous heroes proceeds apace in Aetolia, which was brought into genealogical connection with Elis, because at the Dorian migration the Aetolians seized this part of the Peloponnese, and a mythological excuse had to be found for the occupation. The most interesting of the Aetolian legends is that of Meleager. He killed the Calydonian boar, but when he afterwards slew his uncles in the course of a quarrel, he was cursed by his mother and had to die, as she had thrown into the fire the log of wood on which his life depended. With this is linked the legend of the Arcadian Atalanta, the famous huntress and runner. King Oeneus of Calydon, whose negligence had brought about the ravages of the boar, was the father of Deianeira, wife of Heracles, whose death she unwittingly caused by means of the fatal robe of Nessus. The celebrated river of this district, the Achelous, became the mythological representative of all rivers for the western Greeks, and to a certain extent for the whole of Greece. From Oeneus were descended the mighty heroes Tydeus and Diomedes.

We now turn our attention to some islands of the Aegean and certain parts of the Asiatic mainland. In Crete we find

the sons of Zeus, the ruler of this mountainous island, and of Europa: Minos, Rhadamanthus, and Sarpedon. Of Rhadamanthus we only know that he was remarkable for his justice; Sarpedon emigrates to Lycia; Minos, the friend of Zeus, makes himself respected far and wide. He defeats King Nisus of Megara and Aegeus of Athens, against whom he is enraged on account of the death of his son Androgeus. Finally he comes to Italy and Sicily, where he dies. The legends of Pasiphae, the Minotaur, the Labyrinth, and Ariadne are well known. Rhodes also is drawn into the Cretan cycle of legend, being occupied by a descendant of Minos, Althaemenes, who founds the famous temple of Zeus Atabyrius there. In Rhodes there are two legendary races, the Telchines, who were artificers, and the Heliadae, besides accessions from different quarters, such as Egypt, Phoenicia, and Thessaly. The position of Rhodes, on the border line of the East and West at the south-west corner of Asia Minor, is such that many nations may have been thrown like waves upon its shores. Samothrace was the abode of mysterious deities, to whom the mysteries were consecrated; in Lemnos Hephaestus is said to have fallen to the earth.[6] The Trojan myths are well known; Heracles had already fought against Laomedon, as the Achaeans fought against Priam. In Lydia the gods visited the arrogance of Tantalus, and the presumption of Niobe, the one with just and the other with severe punishment; we can still see in the rock the form which was considered to be the mourning Niobe. Sarpedon and Glaucus dwell in Lycia, worthy representatives of an honourable race.

The exploits of Heracles, in whom is centred the whole force of the heroic age, are less dependent on local suggestion. Heracles fills the whole of Greece with his fame. The basis of the legends of Heracles is the person of the god Melkarth, whose worship the Phoenicians introduced wherever they came. These transplantations of the deity, whose character as

sun-god can always be discerned, lead in the case of Heracles to wanderings which the demi-god is bound to undertake on behalf of others. Heracles thus becomes the irresistible giant, good-natured in the main, and therefore helpful, whose power is sometimes misused, and who, because he has needs not shared by ordinary men, not unfrequently plays a ridiculous part. This is why a comic element is sometimes found in the legends of Heracles.

The legends of various Greeks districts which originally were purely local and had little or no connection with one another, often appear grouped together when we meet with them in literary tradition. We have already more than once noticed the method which the poets and genealogists employ to bring about the connection. The heroes are either unhappy and persecuted in their native land, or violent and criminal, and for these reasons must fly the country. In this way they are brought to the place where their famous deeds were accomplished. But there are other ways of bringing them together in larger numbers, such as a common object, connected with ceremonials or the serious business of life. Funerals and weddings serve for the former, and hunting-parties, wars, and distant expeditions for the latter. The Calydonian hunt and the wars against Thebes have already been mentioned; the two most important expeditions remaining to be noticed are the voyage of the Argonauts and the Trojan War.

The voyage of the Argo was famous in very early times, as the Odyssey shows. The goal—the country where the Golden Fleece was kept—was remote and unknown. It was originally a nature-myth, but became a geographical one. Hence, in course of time, every possible adventure could be interwoven into the narrative. The territory of Aeetes, where the fleece was concealed, was supposed to be in the far East. In this direction there was only one sea, which gradually revealed its secrets to the Greeks, the Pontus Euxinus, and so the territory of Aeetes had to be placed here, and the

towns on the Black Sea became filled with reminiscences of the voyage of the Argonauts. But it was also the desire of western Greece to be celebrated in the tales of the Argonauts. The return voyage of the Argo could be conveniently used for this purpose. For, as an imaginary route was necessary to get say from the Black Sea to North Africa without passing through the Aegean, a little more or less of the marvellous was of no consequence, and the Argo could be made to touch at any port. The most important Greek heroes join in the voyage, but in the actual carrying out of the undertaking they appear more as dignified ornaments than as a genuine element in the legend; the hard work falls to Jason. The inhabitants of Lemnos were considered to be descendants of the Argonauts, and as the bulk of the seafaring heroes consisted of Minyae (for which reason Jason's comrades were called Minyae), so it is assumed that there were Minyae upon Lemnos. This proves also that the Minyae must have been famous navigators, which is confirmed by the fact that Orchomenus belongs to the naval alliance of Calauria. On the other hand, the Argonautic legends do not prove that the Minyae of the city of Iolcus gave any special impulse to Greek navigation, for the importance of the voyage of the Argo in a geographical sense, which could be the only support of this theory, is the result of subsequent gradual extension of the legend.

But the most glorious event of the legendary age is the Trojan War, with its antecedents and its consequences. The legend of the Calydonian boar was a hunting adventure, that of the Argo only one of travel, although full of the marvellous; the legend of the Seven against Thebes was no doubt a war, but waged close to home; the Trojan War contains more than the other legends, for it is the story of a war carried on against a distant city for which great preparations were required, and besides the return journey presents a series of adventures resembling those of the crew of the Argo.

This legend, therefore, included everything which the Greeks most desired to hear, tales of mighty battles and of marvellous travel. It is not our intention to repeat here the events of the Trojan War. Who does not know the story of the wrath of Achilles, the exploits of Hector and Paris, the destruction of Troy, the adventures of the heroes on the voyage back, and the return home? It would be pleasant to know whether there is a basis of fact in these poems, even if exaggerated *ad infinitum*, whether Greeks really did long ago fight against Troy. The possibility of a war between the inhabitants of Greece and Troy cannot be disputed, for it was easy enough to get there. But it is not easy to find a plausible reason for such a war. Wars are generally waged between neighbours, but Greeks and Trojans were a long way distant from one another. Even in the wars of Asiatic peoples against Egypt it is near neighbours who start the campaign, and afterwards involve the more distant nations as allies. Some similar reason must be looked for in this case. The legend would then have put the distant auxiliaries in the place of the original chief combatants. On the other hand, if we wish to contest the historical truth of the campaign against Troy, we may take refuge in the hypothesis that the legend is merely an antedating of the struggles which must have taken place between the immigrant Greeks and the Trojans at the time of the Aeolian migration. It is true that no facts are known from which we may conclude that Troy was of importance at that particular juncture, and was conquered with difficulty. It appears to have been, like Mycenae, prominent only in the age before the Dorian migration. It is possible, however, that the whole legend rests only on a mythological basis. In that case the rape and recovery of Helen would correspond, as Petersen has assumed in his Greek mythology, to the Golden Fleece, which also has to be recovered. It would then only remain to explain why this myth should be especially connected with the locality of

Troy. We may suppose that certain worships, perhaps that of an Aphrodite-Helen, which tradition placed at some spot in Asia Minor (the ancient importance of which might have been then known, for Schliemann has given ocular demonstration of it in our own day), suggested the idea of adorning this spot, which is unique as a collection of ruins, with a legend equally unique.

An interesting part of the myths connected with the Trojan War is formed by the narratives of the return of the heroes to their several homes. They bring into specially clear relief the adventures of Agamemnon and Odysseus, who stand in ethical contrast to one another, corresponding to that of the two typical female characters Clytemnestra and Penelope. The Odyssey is, in short, a collection of the tales of the western seas related in Greece, which in part, like those of the cannibals, bore a universal character.

With the immediate descendants of the heroes of the Trojan War, such as Telemachus and Orestes, who with their comrades have furnished material for the portrayal of some grand characters, the mythological epoch of Greece ceases. A period of obscurity follows, which the genealogists have in vain sought to fill with a series of names.[7]

NOTES

1. Peloponnesus. Recently (Schömann, Gr. Alt., I.[3] p. 22) an ingenious view has been advanced that the word Peloponnese embodies the name of a race called Pelopes, and that they are the equivalent of the Pelasgi. But is it possible that the recollection of such a tribal name could have so completely disappeared? The name Peloponnesus appears first in the Homeric Hymn to the Pythian Apollo (l. 250 and elsewhere). If we bear in mind that Pittheus, the grandfather of Theseus and king of Troizene (like Troizen himself), was the son of Pelops, and consider the relationship of Poseidon to Pelops, as well as his relationship on the other side to Pittheus, Aegeus, and Theseus, and finally that of Asopus, son of Poseidon, it is easy to conclude that Pelops is the mytho-

logical representative of the Ionian race. This would be a confirmation of Curtius' view, which I share, that the Ionians came from Asia Minor.

2. This same method, that of exile, is shown to have existed as a factor in the history of the artists by W. KLEIN, Studien zur griechischen Malergeschichte, I. Archaeol.-epigraph. Mittheil. aus Oesterreich-Ungarn, XI., Wien, 1888, p. 206: "The legends always explain the widespread extension of the arts by the dispersion of the artists." Thus Dipoenus and Scyllis fled from Sicyon, Eucheirus, Eugrammus, Diopus, and Ecphantus from Cypselus to Italy.

3. For the Thessalian myths cf. P. MONCEAUX, La legende et l'histoire en Thessalie, in the Revue des études grecques, I. 229 seq.

4. This humanity of the Athenians is shown in the death of Oedipus, in the atonement of Orestes, and on the occasion when Theseus compelled the Thebans to allow the corpses of their enemies to be burned.

5. Everything connected with Ion is merely later invention, the outcome of an endeavour to make a history for the eponymous hero of the Ionians. The Attic legends as a whole are outside the great stream of Greek myth, which flowed over the south-east of Thessaly, Boeotia, and the north-eastern districts of the Peloponnese.

6. Perhaps the lame Philoctetes on Lemnos is merely a reminiscence of the lame Hephaestus.

7. For this chapter cf. the works on Greek mythology, Grote's Gk. Hist. I., Bursian's Gk. Geography, and, of the works on Greek districts, especially Curtius' Peloponnese. That there was a war for the possession of Troy is not improbable. In that case, however, it is worthy of note that the leader in the war in Asia was a grandson of the hero who came from Asia and settled in the Peloponnese. The grandson of a Phrygian wages war against the Phrygian city of Troy.

CHAPTER XI

THE RELIGION OF THE GREEKS

During the centuries succeeding the settlement of the Greeks upon the soil of Greece, and preceding the Dorian invasion, their material civilization had made marked progress. They had in that interval become acquainted with the productions of Asiatic and Egyptian art, and had themselves made some advance in this direction. But such progress presupposes a development in general culture. By whatever route the earliest Greeks may have reached Europe, they remained in uninterrupted intercourse with their kindred in Asia Minor, and never ceased to receive from them impulses tending to the extension of their intellectual horizon. Their intercourse with the Phoenicians, who landed on the coast, must have had the same effect. The life of the Greeks gradually became fuller and more varied. But it was in religion more than in anything else that this constant intercourse with foreigners produced changes. And here one particular point is worthy of notice. There is perhaps no people whose religion is so difficult to reduce to a system as the Greeks, and none whose religion contains so many contradictory elements. The reason for this lies in the fact that among the Greeks there was never one class of men who were recognized as having the right to lay down the law in religion to the rest of the people. Religion was simply the expression of the popular mind, without exaggeration and without obscurity. Each race had perfect freedom

to worship those gods which suited it, and each in the beginning had specially worshipped certain gods.

The Greek religion, like every primitive one, is a nature-religion. The same phenomena are manifested in all countries to mankind in their beauty, their beneficence, or their awfulness, and when personified become objects of worship. Behind the elements and their various manifestations different deities were supposed to exist.

The Greeks, as we have seen, brought with them the rudiments of this religion from Asia. But they developed it in a peculiar manner, and this development was in its essential features completed when the Dorians conquered the Peloponnesus. We may, therefore, here attempt a sketch of the Greek religion, that is to say, an enumeration of the most prominent divinities which were worshipped at that time by the Greeks, and a description of the attitude in which they stood to the gods. We have, it is true, no authorities at our disposal for that period. The Homeric poems, which pretend to describe it, paint it in the light of later times, and with a subjective colouring. But on the whole it is not difficult to separate the subjective and later elements, and from the general character of the Greek religion in later times, which is known to us, to conjecture what it must have been in its beginnings, when the ideal attributes of the gods had taken shape, and there was only lacking the exterior form, which was given them by Homer and Hesiod, the poets of the first centuries after the Dorian invasion.

Our opinion is perfectly clear that the Greek religion appears on the world's stage as an original one, that is, unmodified by theological or philosophical speculations, and that it retains this character throughout. This is shown by the fact that in the sphere of the gods the contrast between good and evil, which plays such an important part among the Aryans of Persia and is also found in India, is hardly felt at all. Deities whose work is purely destructive do not exist

in Greece, or are banished to the very lowest regions of the world of the gods. It is true that there does appear to be something of the kind in the opposition between the reigning dynasty of the gods and the vanquished and humbled rebels, but the latter are not on that account evil beings. They represent darkness and night, but night and darkness are not looked upon as wholly evil. As a matter of fact we never hear of any action on the part of these vanquished beings. The harmful element proceeds from the gods above quite as much as the beneficial. Each deity acts in accordance with its character. The healing god is also the destroyer, but does not on that account cease to be an object of veneration or to be treated as a benefactor. Actions of the gods which are injurious to mankind may be merely the effect of rage; in this respect the gods are on a level with men. These peculiarities of the Greek religion are to a great extent the result of geographical conditions, and especially of the climate. The climate of Greece has none of those destructive contrasts which are characteristic of nature in Iran, and to a certain extent also in India. The varied aspect of the country has done much to bring about variety in the religion. And because there was no one dominant system, with the sole power of authorizing the adoption of individual worships, it was comparatively easy for the Greeks to absorb foreign gods into their religion in such a manner that they lost their foreign character. The divine world of the Greeks had nothing exclusive about it; but foreign deities had to adapt themselves to the Greek character and give up any extremes that they might possess. Human sacrifice, which was a feature of Oriental worships, was in the long-run out of the question in Greece.

The chief deity is Zeus, the conception of whom arose originally from the contemplation of the clear sky. The sky extends over all things, and rules all things by the phenomena which proceed from it. And because the sky does not always shine in tranquil splendour, so Zeus is not merely a benign

ruler, but also a mighty and awe-inspiring deity, who sends forth the thunderstorm and hurls the lightning. At a time when his rule was contested, he used the lightning in the struggle of the gods against the giants and the Titans, who were flung to the ground and swallowed up by the earth, which they thenceforward convulse as spirits of the earthquakes. But Zeus holds in his hands not only the fire of heaven, but also the waters thereof; he is called the Cloud-Compeller, the Dodonian Zeus, one of the most revered, being especially worshipped as the rain-bringer. From Zeus proceed also the rivers; not far from Dodona flows the river Achelous, considered the most important of all. The elementary force of water was also specially represented by Oceanus, the immediate origin of the rivers; the Styx was described as the eldest daughter of Oceanus. The mountain peaks were dedicated to the chief god, and then to the gods generally; the loftiest mountain in Greek eyes was Olympus, situated on the northern border-line of their territory, and attaining a height of 9750 feet. On its mysterious cloud-girt summit the gods were believed to dwell. In the same way the lofty Ithome and the mountain peaks of Arcadia and Crete were sacred abodes of Zeus. The plain of Olympia was probably not dedicated to the supreme god till later, in consequence perhaps of an agreement between Greeks of different districts.

With Zeus is joined his consort Hera, the goddess of heaven, who was called Dione or Diaina in Dodona. One of the chief seats of her worship was on the mountain Euboea near Argos. This name appears to indicate that Hera was worshipped as a patroness of cattle-breeding; her epithet of "boopis," the ox-eyed, is not so easy to explain. Her famous temples on Mount Ocha in Euboea and on the Lacinian promontory near Croton were also loftily situated, and the name of the island of Samos, which was under her especial protection, signifies height.

While Zeus stands for the sky in general with all its phenomena, and is thus the highest and in an ideal sense the only god of the Greeks, isolated manifestations of the heavens are represented by other deities. First and foremost in this class is Athene, who originally no doubt was the goddess of the waters of heaven and of the phenomena producing and accompanying them. She was born from the head of Zeus, by a blow from a hatchet dealt by Hephaestus or Prometheus. This is the lightning that rends the clouds, from which the beneficent rain then pours forth. But, once in existence, she controls even the phenomena which gave her life. She is the goddess of the thunderstorm; she brandishes the thunderbolt, and is hence called Pallas or the Wielder. She wears as her peculiar adornment and defence the Aegis, a shield with the head of the Gorgon on it. The Gorgon is the thunder-cloud, the tongue-darting serpents surrounding the head are the lightning flashes, which burst forth in all directions. Athene is called Glaucopis, the owl-eyed, probably because she is also the goddess of the clear sky, which has been made bright by the purifying storm, and because the sight of the owl pierces the darkness. In the realm of morals she is the divinity who drives away gloom and oppression, the goddess of clear understanding, of wisdom, and of skill in art, and lastly, the intelligent protectress of man against his foes, and so the goddess of defence, while Ares is more the god of impetuous attack. Athene was never so loyally worshipped, not even in Thessaly or Boeotia, as in the city which bore her name, which strove to make its inward character a reflection of that of the goddess.

One of the most important of the heavenly phenomena is light. Among the dwellers of Iran it was represented in the divine sphere by Mithra, in Greece by Phoebus Apollo. He is equipped with bow and arrows; the arrows are the sun's rays, with which he vanquishes the monsters of the deep and dispels the darkness. As the bright clouds are the cattle and

sheep of the sky, so Apollo is its shepherd, and thus becomes the god of flocks and herds, to which he vouchsafes increase. On the sea the influence of the god of light is beneficial; he calms the storm, hence the dolphin which plays around ships in calm weather is sacred to him, and he himself takes the name of Delphinius. As the god of light he abhors impurity. Outrage and crime pollute, and so he is the enemy of the wicked. But the real struggle with criminals and monsters is left to the demi-gods of light, Heracles, Bellerophon, Perseus, and Theseus. Apollo is moreover the healing god. The god of light also gives to men at their request advice in difficulties; under his protection are the most important oracles, of which that at Delphi soon surpassed the ancient oracle of Zeus at Dodona. The great importance of Apollo to all the Greeks, who worshipped him in Delos, and especially at Delphi, belongs to the period subsequent to the Dorian invasion.

The light of heaven comes to mankind through the sun. The Greeks, like the Indians, assigned a special god to the sun. The Surya of India is the original of Helios, an Apollo with special functions.

The light of day is contrasted with that of night in Artemis. She is the sister of Apollo, and like him, carries a bow and arrows, and is hence represented as a huntress. But this predominant conception of her is modified by the fact that she is also the goddess of fruitful nature. Two originally distinct deities are evidently united in her. In the latter character she corresponds to the great nature-goddess of Asia Minor, *e.g.* in Ephesus, and watches over the virgin scenes of nature far from the haunts of man, over the woods and meadows, and the beasts roaming in them, in short, over everything which does not belong to the province of Demeter, Dionysus, or Apollo. She is the goddess of the moon, but here again a separation of functions has taken place, and the moon is specially represented by Selene.

As among the Indians the first beams of dawn were conceived as benign twin brothers, the Açvins, so the Greeks worshipped the Dioscuri, who also appear to represent the rays of light which pierce the gloom and herald fair weather. Hence the Dioscuri have become the guardians of sailors, and are denoted by stars. The brightness of the lighter clouds seems to have given birth to the conception of the Charites. There were many spirits of the winds among the Greeks: the purely Homeric Aeolus, the Harpies, Boreas, and others. Hermes is also a genuine wind-god. He is the mischievous spirit among the gods, and rightly, for of all the elements the wind does most mischief to mankind. Yet even here the allusion to nature is apparent. Hermes robs Apollo of his cattle, that is to say, the wind drives away the clouds. Apollo, however, pardons the thief, and presents him besides with the insignia of his dignity, the staff, the winged shoes, and the cloud-cap. The wind whistles and sings; Hermes therefore becomes the inventor of the pipe and the lyre. The wind travels fast, so Hermes is the protector of travellers, the messenger of the gods, the conductor of souls, and at last the promoter of all intellectual intercourse.

Prometheus seems originally to have been the spirit of fire. As among the Indians Agni, the god of fire, takes up his abode among men, so Prometheus brings fire to earth, and teaches mankind how to offer sacrifice. With the use of fire begins civilization and humane life. Hence Prometheus is regarded as the civilizer of mankind. But he retires early from the group of the gods, and his importance diminishes. An enmity between him and Zeus is alleged, and of course Zeus remains the victor. Hephaestus now becomes the most important god of fire. He originally represents the lightning, for his appearance on earth is the result of his having been hurled from heaven. Hephaestus is known as the promoter of the use of fire in the arts and crafts. In Attica he was also protector of the hearth, but among the Greeks the hearth

had its own special goddess, Hestia. She is a virgin goddess, who enjoys the highest reverence, both among the gods and in the dwellings of men. She is known as Vesta among the Italians, and therefore must have been worshipped under the same name when Greeks and Italians dwelt together.

In India and Persia we are told of a drink named Soma or Haoma which the gods enjoyed. Among the Greeks the food of the gods is nectar and ambrosia. Probably honey, from which a drink can be obtained by fermentation, or a juice pressed from a kind of ash, suggested the idea which was formed of the nature of nectar or ambrosia. Recently it has been assumed that the task of superintending the preparation of this drink, and then the care of the plant-world in general, was the function of a particular god, Bacchus or Dionysus, who in later times became the god of the vine. Bacchus is the son of Semele, which might mean that the Phoenicians brought the knowledge of the vine to Greece. On the other hand, it was supposed that Dionysus came to Greece by way of Thrace. Of course a knowledge of wine and the cultivation of the vine are two very different things. It would be quite characteristic of the Phoenicians to sell wine to the Greeks, and thus make them acquainted with it, but very unlike them to introduce the vine into Greece, and thus diminish their own profits. The cultivation of the vine may very well have spread over the southern coast of Thrace, where Maronea lay, into Greece.

The ruler of the waters on the earth is Poseidon, brother of Zeus. He is master of the springs, which he produces from the ground by a blow of his trident, and Pegasus, who is descended from him, produces the same effect by a blow from his hoof. The horse in general is sacred to Poseidon; it denotes the swiftly-flowing springs. Although the Greeks brought this conception of Poseidon, as god of the springs, from Asia Minor, on the Aegean Sea they learned to treat him as the ocean god, and then the horse gave an excellent idea of

the rearing and apparently galloping waves. Since then Poseidon remained pre-eminently the god of the sea. The sea-waves shake the rocky cliffs, and so Poseidon was said to be the originator of the earthquake. Races dwelling near the sea united for the joint worship of Poseidon in different districts of Greece. Thus Achaia had a general place of worship sacred to Poseidon in Helice; other Greeks had one on the Isthmus of Corinth; others, who dwelt on the Saronic Gulf and in the Argive Acte, had one on the island of Calauria. A temple of Poseidon stood on the promontory of Sunium. Indeed, nearly all the promontories of Greece had temples upon them, which, however, were not all dedicated to Poseidon. The sea was a familiar element to the Greeks, but inspired them with fear in its stormy moods. Hence the necessity of having a deity present on every promontory to whom they might turn in time of need. And in fine weather what charm must there not have been in a voyage along the coasts of Greece, from the promontories of which the white or painted temples and shrines looked down upon the navigators, assuring them of the ever-present protection of the gods of their native land!

Finally, the earth has the goddess Gaia, who, however, was less worshipped under this name than under that of Demeter. She is the goddess of the fruitful earth, who taught men agriculture, and thus inaugurated the most important advance in civilization. To her were ascribed the institutions of civic life, on which account she is called Thesmophorus. Her worship, which was connected with the mysteries, became of great importance after the Dorian invasion, at a time when religious needs made themselves more felt.

The deities so far described may be regarded as those peculiar to the Greeks when they were an Aryan people, which had developed and individualized its original character in its wanderings westwards and by its sojourn on the Aegean

Sea. The religion is purely one of nature, with no trace of extremes. The moral element appears only indirectly in it. There was no sacerdotal caste; the chiefs of the tribes themselves sacrificed on behalf of the people. The divine services were accompanied by hymns, recited by singers, of whom the hero is the mythical Orpheus. He was said to be a Thracian, and consequently belongs, according to the legend, to the same people who conveyed the cult of Bacchus to Greece, and with whom the worship of the Muses was indigenous. The banks of the Hebrus in Thrace and the district of Pieria at the foot of Olympus are mentioned as the chief abodes of these Thracians, who evidently possessed an advanced civilization. The Thracians have had the same fate as the Epirots. As the oldest worship of Zeus had its origin in Epirus, and yet the people were considered semi-barbarous in later times, so we find the ancient Thracians in possession of the germs of an advanced civilization and their descendants quite uncivilized.[1]

These Aryan forms of worship were reinforced by Semitic cults, mostly introduced by Phoenicians, but some coming direct from Asia Minor. Foremost among them is that of Aphrodite, a Phoenician form of the supreme goddess of nature. Cythera and Corinth were its starting-points in Greece. And as the worship of Adonis was joined to that of Aphrodite, it is possible that the worship of Hyacinthus found in Laconia, which was so open to the influence of Cythera, had a Phoenician origin. Hyacinthus is, like Adonis, a youth carried off in his prime by death, a personification of vegetation scorched up by the heat.

The worship of Ares in Thebes may also be considered as of Phoenician origin. He is mentioned there with Aphrodite as the original ancestor of the house of Cadmus, and as father of Harmonia, the wife of Cadmus. In other respects he would even here have the attributes of a Thracian god. The chief god of the Phoenicians has also left traces in other

Greek worships, for Heracles is partly the same as Melkarth, and Zeus Laphystius is a kind of Moloch. The legend of the Amazons, on the other hand, betrays an influence proceeding from the interior of Asia, perhaps from Cappadocia. They are a poetical transformation of the priestesses in the temple of the goddess Ma at Cumana in Pontus, whose war-dances gave rise to the stories of a nation of women practising warlike exercises.[2] The Amazons are said to have taken part in the founding of the sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesus. Thus we can imagine that the spread of certain worships of Artemis in European Greece led to a reference to the invasions of Amazons. And yet there is a possibility that the invasion of Attica by Amazons, and their defeat by Theseus, have no basis in the history of religion, but, like so many legends, are an invention devised for the glorification of Athens, the hero of which must be in no way inferior to Heracles.

The Greek religion is the expression of the mind of a gifted people, who were close observers of nature. The Greeks saw that man was dependent on higher powers, and that these powers manifested themselves chiefly in the forces of nature around them. But the fortunes of mankind are marked by such great variety and so much contradiction, that the idea of a single God controlling the universe did not occur to them, especially the idea of His ruling alone. A people living in and with nature, like the Greeks, arrives at polytheism of its own accord, especially when there is such a strong anthropomorphic tendency as was the case with them. On the other hand, the natural man also perceives that a certain order must reign even among the forces of nature, and thus he is brought to the conception of a supreme God, who, like a king among the leaders of the people, allows other gods to rule until he thinks fit to interfere in his sovereign capacity. The polytheism of the Greeks was, whatever we monotheists may say to the contrary, by no

means an irrational religion. It endeavoured, while recognizing the divine control of human fate, to account for good and evil fortune happening to good and to bad men alike, by the action of different deities not always acting in harmony with one another. The forces of nature thus grew into beings who watched over morals.

And here we must call attention to another point. When we picture the Greek deities to ourselves, our ideas are influenced by systems which the ancients formed long ago, but which we take up and extend in a wider sense. Athene is for us something definite, Aphrodite is something quite different from her, and each remains much the same whenever they appear on the scene. This may apply to a later Greece, permeated by civilization, but not to the primitive Greeks. Originally, each district had its own god, who performed the functions to be expected of a ruling deity. They received different names, according to the preponderance of certain peculiarities, and according to their extraction. Athene, Artemis, Aphrodite, are in essentials the same divinity, only regarded from different points of view, according to the character and requirements of their worshippers. On the other hand, the same deity in different places is often the same only in name; the Artemis of Ephesus is very different from the Artemis of Delos. The local importance of single deities corrected much that is absurd and even incomprehensible in polytheism.

Thus at the end of the purely mythological period we find the Greeks much advanced in many respects. They have given a more special character to the old deities, have adopted new ones, and have learned and developed the arts. But they were not destined to proceed undisturbed on this path. An internal revolution was about to jeopardize the position they had won, and at the same time give a fresh impulse in other directions.[3]

NOTES

1. It is usually assumed that the Thracians dwelling northward of the Aegean and the Thracians of Boeotia and Attica have nothing in common but the name (BURSIAN, G. Gr. I. 204). The connecting link is formed, however, by the Thracians of Pieria, where the worship of the Muses was indigenous. We may therefore assume that in the earliest times Thracian tribes extended from the shores of the Black Sea to those of the Gulf of Corinth, that they introduced certain cults into Greece, and that they were here absorbed into the great mass of the Greeks, but in the north retrograded in civilization and became barbarians.

2. The customs of the Amazons, on the other hand, are traceable to those of the women of northern peoples, such as the Scythians, Sauromatae, and Massagetae. Cf. the article on the Amazons in Roscher's Lexicon, p. 275.

3. For this chapter also no special proofs can be quoted. Cf. generally the works on mythology :—ROSCHER, PRELLER, PETERSEN (in Ersch und Gruber, Art. Griechenland), the chapter on the subject in Duncker's Geschichte des Alterthums ; lastly, L. SCHMIDT'S Ethik der Griechen. There are some very learned attempts to compose a history of Greek religion in primitive times, partly from a purely Greek standpoint, *e.g.* PETERSEN in his mythology quoted above, partly from an Indo-Germanic point of view, *e.g.* G. WLASTOFF, Prométhee, Pandore et la légende des siècles, S. Pétersb. 1883, who assumes an earlier Pelasgic-Ionian religion, to which were added by a later influx the ideas that harmonize with Indian conceptions, of which Hesiod is the exponent. So far, the results of these researches are not of a kind to find place in a compendious history of Greece. A brief reference only can be made here to two factors which may possibly be of importance for early Greek religion, viz. (1) the worship of the dead, on which cf. the interesting remarks of P. Gardner, New Chapters, Ch. XI., and (2) the worship of the Daimones (Fustel de Coulanges, Milchhöfer).

CHAPTER XII

THE DORIAN INVASION. THE COLONIES IN ASIA MINOR

THE great change which took place in Greece about the year 1000 B.C. was that a Greek race, which had hitherto been of no importance, made itself by a formidable onslaught master of a great part of the Peloponnese, and thus produced revolutions in the rest of the country, which proved of the greatest importance for the geographical distribution of the Greeks, and their expansion over the face of the earth, as also for their civilization. These were the Dorians, who appeared on the scene as conquerors, and afterwards remained, as long as the Greeks retained their independence, the most warlike people of the whole nation, and one of those two which have left the impress of their character upon Greece as a whole.

The Dorians [1] do not become of any consequence until after they have conquered the Peloponnese. Yet we should like to have some definite knowledge of the previous history of this highly important race. Herodotus gives us an account according to which they dwelt in Phthiotis under Deucalion, and in Hestiaeotis near Olympus under Dorus son of Hellen, were driven out of Hestiaeotis by the Cadmeans, and settled on Mount Pindus under the name of Macedonians; from there they went to the land of the Dryopians on the river Pindus, whence they proceeded finally to the Peloponnese. But how much of this is historical? Their homes under Deucalion and Dorus are perhaps just as historical as those two heroes them-

selves. Their home on Mount Pindus looks like a confusion with their sojourn on the river Pindus in the Dryopian Doris; this latter district is after all the only one that can be proved to be Dorian. But it is extremely probable that they came from Thessaly. The accounts of the ancients respecting the Boeotians show that there were migrations of Greek races from north to south in those days. The Boeotians were said to have originally dwelt in Thessaly, but to have been driven from their home in the district of Arne in the Peneius valley by the Thessalians, who had come over from Thesprotia. Thus the Thessalians became masters of the fair valley lying east of the Pindus range, while the Boeotians retreated southwards. This is said to have taken place sixty years after the Trojan War.[2] This invasion of the Thessalians and retreat of the Boeotians is closely connected with the migration of the Dorians from Thessaly, the idea being that the Thessalians dislodged the Dorians.[3] However, there is no record of these events, so we must be content to assume that at a certain date (not exactly determinable, but probably about 1000 B.C.) great national movements took place in Greece, which resulted in the first place in a re-arrangement of the populations in the Peneius valley, then of those of central Greece, and finally of the Peloponnese.

After these events the Thessalians reigned in the country of the Peneius. Around them and in a subordinate position were the aboriginal races of the Perrhaebi on the southern slopes of Mount Olympus, the Magnetes upon Pelion, the Dolopes on the ranges of Pindus, and the Aenianes and Phthiotian Achaeans about Mount Othrys. In central Greece the Dorians occupied the Dryopian territory on the river Pindus, while the Boeotians inhabited the district round the Copaic Lake, where the importance of Orchomenus almost entirely disappears, while that of Thebes remains. But the greatest changes occurred in the Peloponnese. And here it is not the Dorians alone who have the glory of the achievement.

They share it with the descendants of Heracles, who according to tradition were the kings of the Dorians when the latter conquered the Peloponnese. Here we relapse into legend again, but the legend must be related because it had the greatest influence upon the historical and political conceptions of the Greek people, as long as they retained their power and freedom.

Aegimius, king of the Dorians, made war on the Lapithae. Heracles assisted the Dorians, and vanquished the Lapithae, but did not take possession of the country promised to him as a reward. When the hero was dead, Aegimius, out of gratitude for the help received, made Hyllus the son of Heracles his heir. Thus Hyllus and his descendants acquired for the Dorians the same rights they themselves possessed in their capacity of Heraclidae. The right of dominion over Argos and Argolis was certainly one of them. For here Heracles' persecutor Eurystheus ought not to have ruled, but Heracles himself, and this gave his descendants a claim to Argolis. A sufficient basis for their claim upon Sparta was found in the aid given by Heracles to Tyndareus, who had promised in return to keep the country for the descendants of the hero—fictions of this kind are part of the stock-in-trade of the genealogists. In Elis Heracles had defeated Augeias, and had placed Nestor on the throne of Pylus; this sufficed, in the absence of other reasons and for variety's sake, to give his descendants a right to dispose of these countries. If, then, the Dorians were strong enough to conquer the Peloponnese, they were at full liberty to do so, for they were only enforcing long-standing claims.[4]

Hyllus made an attempt to conquer the Peloponnese. He had received a reply from the Delphic oracle that the Heraclidae should wait for the third fruit. This he referred to the yearly harvest, and in the third year he invaded the Peloponnese by the Isthmus. A single combat was to decide the issue, and the Tegean Echemus slew Hyllus. The Heraclidae there-

fore returned and settled at Marathon in Attica. Cleodaeus, son of Hyllus, renewed the attempt, but with the same ill success, which also befell the son of Cleodaeus, Aristomachus. The latter left three sons—Temenus, Cresphontes, and Aristodemus, who complained at Delphi of the continued failure of an undertaking sanctioned by the god, and were told that the "third fruit" meant the third generation, which had now come. They were to cross the straits at Naupactus, and not proceed by way of the Isthmus, and were to take as guide a man with three eyes. They made the venture eighty years after the Trojan War, as Thucydides says. They found the three-eyed man in the Aetolian Oxylus, a man with one eye who met them riding upon a horse. At that time the ruler in Sparta and Argolis was Tisamenus, son of Orestes and Hermione, the daughter of Menelaus. Oxylus had bargained for the kingdom of Elis as his reward, and as he feared that if the Dorians saw that fair country they would take it for themselves, he led them not through Elis, but by way of Arcadia into the country to which they laid claim. Tisamenus was defeated, and the Achaeans retired towards the north coast of the Peloponnese into the territory of the Ionians. Oxylus conquered Elis in a war in which the Aetolian Pyraechmes defeated the Epean Degmenus in single combat. Argos, Laconia, and Messenia were divided by lot among the Heraclidae, Temenus and Cresphontes, and the sons of Aristodemus, Eurysthenes and Procles; but Cresphontes, who coveted the fertile Messenia, attained his object only by means of a trick. According to old tradition, incidents of the conquest of the Peloponnese can be traced in the name of the city of Naupactus, situated on the narrowest part of the Corinthian Gulf, where the Dorians built their transports, and where the festival of the Carneia in Sparta took place, originally a festival of expiation for the murder of a pious seer named Carnus in the course of the campaign.

If there is any historical truth in these myths, it may per-

haps be found in the routes by which the conquerors penetrated into the countries of the Peloponnese. Dorians may really have crossed the gulf at Naupactus, and have proceeded thence through Arcadia to the east and south. It appears that in their infancy the two southern Dorian states lay more to the north. Stenyclarus was the original royal city, and Sparta was not strong enough to conquer Amyclae at once, which lies close at hand to the south.[5] It is possible that the Dorians attacked Argolis from the west, but certainly not only from that side, for the Temenium, a fortress from which they waged war on Tisamenus, was on the coast.[6] We must therefore suppose either that the Dorians came thither in ships, or that they received reinforcements from the side of the sea. The course of events seems to have been similar at the subjection of Corinth. The Heraclid Aletes[7] attacked this important commercial city, at that time inhabited by Ionians, from a fortress erected upon the hill Solygeius, on the Gulf of Cenchreae.[8] We may consequently assume that the Dorians were not such strangers to the sea as has been supposed by the systematizers of Greek history; and we may adopt the view of the conquest of the Peloponnese which is now generally accepted, viz. that the Dorian subjection of the peninsula by means of one homogeneous expedition only existed in the imagination of the genealogists, and that it was rather effected by separate bodies of warriors, some of whom went from Aetolia to Elis, and thence through Arcadia southwards, others from Doris to the east of the Peloponnese, the latter in part by the longer sea route round Boeotia and Attica.[9]

The coast-line of the Corinthian Gulf was in possession of the Ionians, the so-called Aegialeans. Argive Achaeans under Tisamenes drove them out, and settled in twelve towns. The Ionians fled to Attica, where, according to the legend, they found other fugitives, the Pylian Neleidae, descendants of Neleus and kinsfolk of the sage Nestor, under Melanthus, who was king at Athens. The conquest of

Corinth[10] by Aletes is said to have taken place in the reign of Doridas and Hyanthidas. The further occupation of the north-east corner of the Peloponnese is related as follows.[11] Temenus of Argos had several sons and a daughter named Hyrnetho, who married a Heraclid, Deiphontes. The sons out of hatred of the favoured son-in-law slew their father, and one of them, Ceisus, became king of Argos. Deiphontes conquered Epidaurus, the Ionian inhabitants of which fled to Attica. The Dorians then conquered Aegina, and founded a second Epidaurus on the south-eastern coast of the Peloponnese. Agaeus, the fourth son of Temenus, was received by the Ionians of Troizene into their city. Phalces, the second son of Temenus, proceeded to Sicyon, where the Heraclid Lacestadas was already king, and shared the government with him. The son of Phalces, Rhegnidas, marched against Phlius, which submitted to him. The Dryopes, when expelled from the slopes of Parnassus, had migrated to Hermione and Asine, which belonged to the Argive Acte. The Dorians did not come into close connection with the valleys of the Peneius and Alpheius, that is, with the western districts of the Peloponnese. In the valley of the Peneius, Elis was founded by the Aetolian allies of the Dorians, and these Eleans extended their influence over the Alpheius valley as far as Pisa, the importance of which began to diminish in consequence of the Dorian invasion. Arcadia remained unaffected by Dorian influence, preserving its independence and the old grouping of its population.

The wave of migration set in motion by the Dorian invasion did not spend its force in Europe, but inundated also the Asiatic coast-line and many islands of the Aegean. Of the latter, it was principally those farthest removed from Greece which were occupied, or at all events of which a record of the occupation exists. The adjoining islands, the Cyclades, were gradually and peacefully colonized by the Ionians (except a few which became Dorian), after they had been partly in the

possession of the Carians. The history of the colonization of the coasts and islands of Asia Minor is according to tradition as follows.[12]

The most northerly colonies were styled Aeolian. They should more accurately be called Achaean, if their founders were really Achaeans of the Peloponnese, who had fled from the Dorians, or had migrated eastwards at an earlier stage.[13] For according to Hellanicus, Orestes himself was the founder of the colony in Lesbos. According to Strabo, that is, on the authority probably of Ephorus, Orestes was the leader of the band, but died in Arcadia, whereupon his son Penthilus led them through Boeotia and Thessaly to Thrace, and afterwards his son brought them to Dascylium on the Propontis. The grandson of Penthilus, Gras, colonized the fertile island of Lesbos, with its deep bays, which soon numbered five important cities—Mitylene, Methymna, Antissa, Eresus, and Pyrrha. Another body of Achaeans under Cleuas and Malaus sojourned for a time in Locris, and then proceeding direct to Asia founded Cyme. Cyme received the name of Phriconis after the mountain Phricion in Locris, from which place colonists had joined the expedition. From Cyme, Smyrna appears to have been colonized, the most southern of the Aeolian settlements, which long remained a bone of contention between the Aeolians and Ionians. Smyrna lay to the south of Mount Sipylus, in the innermost recess of the bay into which the river Hermus empties itself, and thus served as a seaport for Sardis, the Lydian capital, situated in the valley of the Hermus. In the interior, on the northern slope of Mount Sipylus, lay Magnesia, evidently an Aeolian settlement of Magnetes from Thessaly, but not so famous as the more southern Magnesia on the river Maeander, which is expressly mentioned as an Aeolian city. There were besides a number of small Aeolian towns on or near the coast opposite Lesbos, and farther south towards the Hermus.[14] Lastly, the district of Troas and the islands of Tenedos and Hecatonnesus

were also Aeolian. Thus the Aeolian territory stretches from the Hellespont to the river Hermus. The name Aeolian was perhaps given to these colonies to describe the various elements of which they were composed.

Next to them on the south come the Ionian colonies.[15] The legend makes these start from Athens. At Athens Theseus had been succeeded by Menestheus, who commanded the Athenian forces at Troy. Menestheus however was succeeded by several Theseidae, Demophon, Oxyntas, Apheidas and Thymoitas. The Neleidae, expelled from Pylos by the Dorians, fled to Athens, where they were amicably received. In a war with the Boeotians it happened that the Boeotian king Xanthus challenged Thymoitas to single combat. Thymoitas did not accept the challenge, but the Nelid Melanthus offered his services, fought with success, and was on that account made king of Athens. He was succeeded by his son Codrus.

In the meanwhile disturbances continued in the Peloponnese, where the Dorians were extending their sway. Fugitives continued to flock to Athens from all sides. At last the Dorians marched upon Athens itself. The oracle had told them that they would succeed if they spared the life of Codrus. But Codrus managed to get himself killed, and the Dorians withdrew, retaining their hold only on Megara. Codrus had no royal successor in Athens. He was so excellent a man, it was said later, that his like could not be found—rather a happy jest. The actual government, however, of the state remained in his family, only the rulers were called henceforward archons instead of kings. His two sons Medon and Neleus disputed the succession. The oracle decreed it to the former, and Neleus in consequence left Athens and went to Asia, where many joined him—Athenians, Peloponnesians, Ionians, Minyae from Orchomenus, Abantes from Euboea, Phocians, Thebans, Dryopes, Molossians, Arcadians, Pelasgians and Dorians from Epidaurus. Collectively they called themselves Ionians.

Among the cities founded by them were numbered the largest and finest of Greek Asia. The most important was Miletus, admirably situated at the entrance of a bay which has now become dry land. The district was inhabited by Carians. The name Miletus has been explained as that of a Cretan youth who fled to Asia. The Ionians under Neleus killed the male inhabitants of the place and married the women. The famous temple of Apollo Didymeus, south of Miletus, was older than the Ionian colony.[16] The next town of importance was Ephesus, colonized by the Codrid Androclus, and situated in the fertile district at the entrance to the valley of the Caÿster, which was one of the chief routes from the interior of Asia to the sea. Here Leleges, Lydians and Amazons had lived near the famous temple of Artemis. The Ionians took possession of the upper town and left the precincts of the temple to the native inhabitants. Androclus occupied Samos for a time, and helped the Pryeneans against the Carians. The two cities, Myus to the south and Priene to the north of the Maeander, were captured from the Carians. The founder of Myus was the Codrid Cyaretus, those of Priene the Nelid Aepytus and the Theban Philotas. Colophon, in the neighbourhood of which stood the shrine of the Clarian Apollo, was at first inhabited by Carians and Cretans, who were joined by Thebans, and later by the Ionians in virtue of treaties. Their rulers were Damasichthon and Promethus, sons of Codrus. On the coast-line, which here projects northwards into the sea and terminates in the island of Chios, lay the Ionian cities Lebedos, Teos, Erythrae and Clazomenae. Lebedos, which was at first Carian and never of any importance, was colonized by the Codrid Andraemon. In Teos there dwelt Carians and Minyae from Orchomenus, followed by Ionians under the Melanthid Apoecus, and by Athenians under Codridae and Boeotians. Erythrae was occupied by Cretans, Lycians, Carians and Pamphylians (Greeks roaming about with Calchas after the fall of Troy),

and by volunteers from the rest of the Ionian cities under the leadership of the Codrid Cnopus. Clazomenae was not inhabited when the Ionians came there. Its founders, chiefly people from Cleonae and Phlius, had formerly dwelt on Mount Ida and in the territory of Colophon. Chios, the mountainous soil of which produced highly-prized wine and mastic, an island devastated by terrible earthquakes in modern times, prided itself on having Chios, son of Poseidon, for its original founder. Afterwards Oenopion came from Crete, followed by Carians, and lastly by Abantes from Euboea. The local legends of the island of Samos had been narrated by the Epic poet Asius. By Astypalaea, daughter of Phoenix, Poseidon had a son Ancaeus, who ruled over the Leleges and married Samia, whose father was the river Maeander. Their daughter Parthenope became mother of Lycomedes by Apollo. During the Ionian migration Epidaurians came there under Procles, a descendant of Ion, son of Xuthus. The far-famed worship of Hera in Samos, derived in the opinion of many writers from Argos, was probably aboriginal. Hera was said to have been born in Samos on the river Imbrasus. The most northerly city of the Ionians was Phocaea, at the entrance of the Gulf of Smyrna, built by Phocians under the leadership of the Athenians Damon and Philogenes on a hitherto uninhabited promontory, and in consequence of an understanding with the Smyrneans, but not received into the religious community of the Ionians until it took Codrids from Erythrae and Teos for its rulers. The Ionian cities and islands extended from the Gulf of Smyrna as far as the bay to the north of Halicarnassus. This part of the coast includes three promontories with the islands of Chios and Samos adjacent to the two northern ones, and the territory round the mouths of the Caÿster and Maeander. The ancients noticed the great length of the coast-line of this country, but centuries of barbarism have considerably reduced it, and many fine harbours have become silted up; Ephesus and Miletus will never be seaports again. The so-called

Ionians were a mixture of races, like the Aeolians. They were united by the common worship of the Heliconian Poseidon on the promontory of Mycale, which was derived from the Peloponnesian Ionians (Achaia), and this may be the principal reason why they all called themselves Ionians. In later times Athens made use of the name for her own glorification.

Finally we come to the Dorian colonies. Among the Heraclidae descended from Temenus, was Althaemenes, who took part in the campaign against Attica. He led Dorians from Argos to Crete; others migrated to Rhodes, where they founded three cities, Lindus, Ialysus, and Cameirus. Formerly Phoenicians and Carians had settled at Rhodes.[17] Cnidus, situated on the outermost point of a long peninsula in the neighbourhood of Rhodes, was a colony from Argos and Sparta; Triopas was worshipped as its founder, and the neighbouring promontory, on which the Dorians sacrificed to Apollo, was called Triopium. To the north, almost opposite Cnidus, was the town of Halicarnassus, built by Dorian and Ionian Troizenians under Anthes. The Ionians introduced the worship of the Isthmian Poseidon, the Dorians that of Apollo. An ancient inscription, of which we have a copy made about the second century B.C., begins with Telamon, a son of Poseidon, and enumerates the names of twenty-seven successive hereditary priests of Poseidon, embracing a period of 504 years. In front of the bay, the entrance of which is commanded by Halicarnassus, lay the island of Cos, which, with the neighbouring islands of Nisyrus and Calymnus, was colonized by Dorians from Epidaurus. The tutelar deity of Cos was Asclepius, the same as that of Epidaurus. The Dorian colonies of Asia Minor covered a smaller extent of territory than the Ionian. They communicated with the Peloponnese by way of Carpathos, Casos, and Crete in the south, and Astypalea, Anaphe, Thera, and Melos in the north. Of these islands the most important was Crete, long, narrow, and mountainous, according to the Odyssey inhabited by

Dorians even then—a statement derived from secondhand evidence; but after the campaigns of the Heraclidae, Althaemenes and Pollis planted settlements there, especially at Lyctus, which was regarded as the daughter of Lacedaemon, while Cnossus belonged to Minos.[18] All these islands stretching across from Asia to Europe were Dorian, but did not belong to the closer confederation which included Halicarnassus, Cos, Cnidus, and Rhodes, though without any definite form of union.[19]

We have still to describe another sphere of Greek colonization, which does not fit into the divisions of Aeolian, Ionian, and Dorian. In the farthest corner of the Mediterranean, between the southern coast of Asia Minor and Syria, lies Cyprus, the third largest of the islands of the Mediterranean. It consists of a central low-lying plain between a long ridge to the north and a broader mountain district to the south. The climate of Cyprus is very warm and the soil fertile; in ancient times copper, the metal named after it, was found there. The island is more accessible from the east and south than from the north, and is close to Phoenicia. Hence Cyprus was first visited by and came under the influence of the Phoenicians. The worship of Aphrodite, which was famous in Paphos and Amathus, came there from Syria. But in very early times Aryans dwelt there as well as Semites. The list of nations in Genesis connects Chittim (the town Chitium or the name of the tribe Chetites?) with Japhet through Javan. Greek tradition[20] wished to make Greeks returning from Troy the first colonists of Cyprus; the founding of Salamis was ascribed to Teucer for very intelligible reasons. In Salamis, which lay to the east of the island towards Syria, an almost pure Greek art prevailed, as discoveries made there prove. The central depression, referred to above, extends from Soli in the west to Salamis, and this is where the Greeks seem especially to have settled. Along the south coast, on the other hand, the Phoenician element was the

preponderating one. Even if at the epoch when European Greeks were pouring into Asia a second time, many of them came to Cyprus—hence no doubt the assumption that there were Argives among the colonists—we may still assume that there were early Greek settlements there. In later times we find a peculiar method of writing in use among the Cypriote Greeks, which probably had its origin on the island. It must have been of earlier origin than the use of the Greek alphabet, for why should Greeks have changed to a less perfect system? The cities of Cyprus were ruled by separate princes. The Cypriotes were always rather wanting in energy, and so the island has almost always been under foreign domination, first Asiatic and then Egyptian. Towards the end of the eighth century B.C. seven Cypriote princes submitted to the Assyrian Sargon, who erected a statue of himself with a record of his exploits in Chitium. A quarter of a century later there is a list of ten Cypriote princes, who were subject to Asarhaddon, among them four Greeks, belonging to Paphos, Curium, Idalium, and Chytri. Cyprus also has a share in the development of Greek Epic poetry. In modern times the island has become famous through the discoveries of Palma di Cesnola, among which the treasure of Curium (?) reminds us of those of Schliemann. They prove that Cypriote art was a local one, based on Egyptian, Assyrian, and Greek patterns.[21]

We have thus seen that the Dorian invasion is the cause of radical changes throughout the whole of Greece. The Peloponnese is almost completely transformed, and becomes in the hands of Dorians for a long period the leading state of Greece. On the west coast of Asia Minor a series of flourishing communities are founded by the Greeks who had come thither from Europe.

The period during which all these changes took place cannot be accurately determined. The statements of the ancients rest on calculations which have no solid basis. Knowledge is

claimed of the number of generations which elapsed between the beginning of the movement and the times when a record of ancient history was kept, but this is impossible. Modern calculations are also mere conjecture. All we can say is that the events above described took place somewhere about 1000 B.C.[22]

NOTES

1. K. O. Müller, Die Dorier, 2 Ausg., 2 Bde., Berl. 1844. For the early history of the Dorians, Herod. 1, 56, who calls them an ἔθνος πολυπλάνητον κάρτα. Here and in 8, 43 he designates the Dorian ἔθνος as Μακεδνόν; no doubt he means by this the Macedonians who, according to him, apparently separated from the Dorians at Olympus.

2. For the immigration of the Boeotians into Boeotia, Thuc. 1, 12.

3. It is usual to place the Dorians at the time of Heracles in Hestiaeotis (Duncker, 5, 144). On the other hand, Strabo (427) makes them dwell on Mt. Oeta, and consequently in Doris at this early period. It is true that a struggle between them and the Lapithae would seem to be more suitable in northern Thessaly. On the other hand, if Hyllus has already become king in Hestiaeotis by the aid of Aegimius king of the Dorians, and he himself has already, according to the legend, endeavoured to conquer the Peloponnese, there is hardly time for this "sojourn" on Mt. Pindus and in Dryopis, which was the "μητρόπολις τῶν ἁπάντων Δωριέων" (Str. 427). It is true he might, to win his inheritance, have undertaken a march on Argos direct from Thessaly, but this only suits the story, not history. All this is additional proof that the attempt to make history and chronology out of the beautiful legends of Greece is a task of the Danaids. Boeotians made their first appearance in Thessaly under another name, and then returned to Boeotia, at a time when the children of Orestes were already at Aulis on their voyage to Asia, whereupon the Boeotian Pelasgians retired to Athens, and the Thracians to Parnassus: Str. 9, 401, on account of Homer.

4. For the mythical history of the campaign of the Heraclidae see Apollod. 2, 7 and 8. For the promises of Tyndareus in favour of the Heraclidae, Diod. 4, 33. Quite distinct accounts of the claims of the Dorians over the Peloponnese are found in Plato, Leg. 3, 6, 7, pp. 682-86; further discrepancies in Isocr. Archid., 119, 120.

One account is as historical as the other ; the accepted tradition is no sounder than that of Plato or Isocrates ; they are all legends, which can neither be proved nor contradicted. For the exploits of the Aetolians see Str. 357 and Paus. 5, 3, 4. The crossing into the Peloponnese took place acc. to Thuc. 1, 12 eighty years after the Trojan War. Oxylus, according to Apollodorus, was one-eyed ; acc. to Paus. 5, 3, 5, it is the ἡμίονος that is one-eyed.

5. Acc. to Polyaen. 1, 10, the Heraclidae conquered Laconia from Argos.

6. For the Temenium, Paus. 2, 38, 1 ; Polyaen. 2, 12.

7. Aletes is properly the representative of the cosmopolitan Phoenicians, who in early times evidently settled at Corinth ; afterwards the name was transferred to the comparatively unknown leader of the Dorian conquerors. See Witisch in Roscher, Lexicon, 229. Corinth, acc. to Vell. Pat. 1, 13, was conquered by the Dorians 952 years before its destruction by Mummius, consequently in 1098 B.C.

8. For the conquest of Corinth, Thuc. 4, 42, 43. In solving the question how Argolis could be taken, we must take note of the fact that the fortification of Mt. Treton at Mycenae must have considerably increased the difficulty of an attack from the north.

9. Grote (I. 555) concurs that the conquest of the Peloponnese was accomplished partly by means of a fleet starting from the Malian Gulf, following the route which the Dryopes had taken.

10. For the conquest of Corinth, see Paus. 2, 4, 3 ; Con. 26 ; Suid. *πάντα ὀκτώ*. For other legends concerning Aletes cf. Dur. fr. 80 Müll. Schol. Pind. Nem. 7, 155. Aletes called the ancient Ephyra *Διὸς Κόρινθος*.

11. For the occupation of the north-eastern Peloponnese, see Paus. 2, 19 ; Nic. Damasc. fr. 38, 41 ; Müll. Diod. Exc. de insid. Epidaurier nach Attica, Paus. 2, 26, 2. Troizene, Scymn. 533. Phlius, Paus. 2, 13, 1, 2. Dryopians, Herod. 1, 56 ; 7, 30 ; 8, 43 ; Paus. 4, 34, 9 ; 5, 1, 2.

12. It is impossible to construct a chronology of the colonization of Asia Minor. The relative dates of the three streams of immigration are according to traditional records the following :—First, the Aeolians settled in Asia, and then about the same date, the Ionians and Dorians. The founding of the colony in Lesbos falls acc. to Ps. Plut. vit. Hom. 130 years after the sack of Troy, while acc. to Clem. Al. Strom. 1, 21, the founding of the Ionian colony took place 140 years after that. In reality it was throughout a long and gradual process. Our knowledge of the antiquities of Asia Minor has greatly increased in the last few decades, owing to the zeal and emulation of nearly all civilized nations, especially

the English, French, Germans, Austrians, and Americans: Hamilton, Fellows, Newton, Wood, Ramsay, Perrot, Waddington, Rayet, Schliemann, Humann, Curtius, Hirschfeld, Puchstein, Benndorff, Clarke, and others.

13. For Orestes, founder of Lesbos, see Hellan. fr. 114. The Aeolian colonies are mentioned in Str. 13, 582 (vaguely); 13, 622: here and in 9, 402 *re* Cyme: Paus. 3, 2, 1; 2, 18, 6; Diod. 5, 81, v. Hom. 38.—For Lesbos cf. Plehn, Lesbiaca, Berl. 1826; A. Couze, Reise nach der Insel Lesbos, Hannov. 1865.—For Smyrna see Herod. 1, 150; Str. 14, 632-634. Lane, Smyrn. res g. Gott. 1851; Mylonas, De Smyrn. reb. g. Gott. 1866; Curtius, Beiträge, 1872 (see below under Ephesus); Weber, Le Sipylos, Par. 1880.—Southern Magnesia (round the Maeander) called an Aeolic city by Strabo, 14, 647, Δελφῶν ἄποικοι acc. to Ath. 4, 173. If the Aeolic dialect in Asia Minor and Lesbos can only be properly compared with that of Northern Thessaly and Boeotia (Brugmann, Griech. Gramm. in I. Müller's Handbuch d. Klass. Alterthumsw. I. p. 13), the story of emigrants from Achaia appears somewhat dubious.

14. The twelve cities of the mainland are enumerated by Herod. 1, 149. Of these Myrina has lately become known through discoveries of terra-cotta articles (E. Pottier et S. Reinach, La Nécropole de Myrina, Par. 1886), but it is not a clearly Aeolian city. It was important by reason of its position on a lofty hill between the sea and the fertile valley, and its interesting remains have been carefully investigated of late by Americans. Assos, cf. Clarke, Investigations at Assos, Boston 1882. Researches in Aeolis by Ramsay, Journ. Hell. Stud. II.

15. For the Ionian colonies cf. Herod. 1, 142-148; 7, 94, 95; Str. 14, 632 seq.; Paus. 7, 2, 1 seq.; Ael. V. H. 8, 5 (Naxos occupied first). Acc. to Herodotus 1, 171 the islands of the Aegean were taken from the Carians by the Ionians and Dorians. Acc. to Thuc. 1, 4 the Carians had been already driven from the islands by Minos. We must add a few remarks to the tradition as given in the text. It is highly probable that not only did the fresh colonization of the coasts of Asia Minor last longer than tradition assumes, but also that Athens had not so much share in the Ionian colonies as was asserted, especially about B.C. 500, when, as it appears, the sanctuary of Codrus, Neleus, and the Basile was founded at Athens, which we now know from an inscription lately discovered and published in the Ephemeris of 1884 and discussed by Curtius in the Arch. Ges. 5 May, 1885. Even the legend puts the Hellenic immigration into Colophon at an earlier date than the arrival of the Ionians, who concluded a treaty πρὸς τοὺς ἐν

Κολοφῶνι Ἕλληνας (Paus. 7, 3, 3). The earliest history of Samos and Chios (Paus. 7, 4) gives us also the impression that the comparatively unknown incidents of the settlement extended over a long period. As regards Athens in her capacity of parent city, on the one hand the number of Neleidae are suspicious, and on the other the tracing of Procles, founder of Samos, from Ion, son of Xuthus (Paus. 7, 4, 2), is only a way of getting out of a difficulty. Lastly, the number of Ionians who migrated to Asia does not appear to have been large even according to the legend. The supposition of Curtius, that they found a kindred population there, is all the more natural. That Ionia possessed the finest climate, has been noticed by Herod. 1, 142, who also states (2, 10) that the rivers of Ionia were silting up its bays even in early times; but it possessed a very long coast-line as late as Strabo (14, 632).

16. Miletus.—An Athenian colony, Herod. 1, 146; 5, 97; 6, 21; 9, 97; Strabo 14, 632-636; Paus. 7, 2, 6. Dissertations of Schröder, Strals. 1826; Soldau, Darmst. 1829; Schmidt, Gött. 1855, 56. Cf. also Newton's work quoted below "A History of Discoveries, &c." A magnificent work, as yet unfinished, is that of Rayet et Thomas, Milet et le Golfe Latmique, Paris 1877 seq. (Excavations by Rayet in Miletus at the expense of the Paris Rothschilds; results in the Louvre).

Ephesus. Story of its colonization acc. to Creophylus quoted in Athen. 8, 361. Cf. also Str. 14, 633, 634, 639-42; Plut. Qu. Gr. 55; Paus. 7, 4, 2. Of modern writers: Guhl, Ephesiaca, Berl. 1842; Falkener, Ephesus and the Temple of Diana, Lond. 1862; E. Curtius, Beiträge z. Gesch. und Topogr. Kleinasiens, Abh. d. Berl. Akad. 1872; Ephesus, Berl. 1874. Important excavations made by Englishmen: J. T. Wood, Discoveries at Ephesus, Lond. 1877; Head, Coinage of Ephesus, Lond. 1880 (Numism. Chron.).

Myus. Str. 14, 633, 636; Paus. 7, 2, 10; Plut. mul. virt. 16; Polyaen. 8, 25.

Priene. Str. 8, 384; 14, 633, 636, 639; Paus. 7, 2, 9. Discoveries by Englishmen: cf. Soc. Dilett. 1881 (Pullan and Newton) on the ruins of the temple of Athene Polias in Priene; sculptures in London. Lenschau, De rebus Prienensium, Lips. 1889.

Colophon. Paus. 7, 3, 1. Its founder acc. to Strabo 14, 633 was the Pylian Andraemon. The Colophonian Mimnermus traced the origin of his city direct to Pylos, Str. 14, 634, 642, 643. C. A. Pertz, Colophoniaca, Gott. 1848. Fine coins in Colophon at a later period. The positions of Colophon, Notium, and Clarus have been established by Schuchhardt, Mittheil. der arch. Inst. Athen, 1887, pp. 398-434.

Lebedos. Paus. 7, 2, 2. Founder acc. to Str. 14, 633 Andropompus.

Teos. Paus. 7, 3, 3, and with but slight variations Str. 14, 633, 643, 644. Division of the citizens into πύργοι. English discoveries :—temple of Bacchus, see above, Priene.

Erythrae. Paus. 7, 3, 7. Founder, Cnopus acc. to Str. 14, 633, Κνωπούπολις acc. to Steph. Byz. h. v. For the fate of Cnopus, &c. Polyaen. 8, 43 ; Athen. 6, 258, 259. Acc. to Paus. 7, 5, 5 an ancient worship of the Tyrian Heracles existed in Erythrae. Intercourse with its neighbour Chios, Herod. 1, 142 and Dittenb. Syll. n. 370 ; Lamprecht, De rebus Erythr., Berl. 1871. Plan in Lebas, Voy. archéol. éd. Reinach, pl. 70.

Clazomenae. Str. 14, 644, 645 ; Paus. 7, 3, 8. At a later period Clazomenae possessed splendid coins, see Coins of the Ancients ; J. Labahn, De rebus Clazomen. Greifsw. 1875 ; Spiro, De Clazomen. mercatura, Berlin 1855 ; Lebas, Voy. archéol. éd. Reinach, pl. 72.

Chios. After Oenopion and his sons Amphiclus reigned, who came from the Euboean Histiaea, Paus. 7, 4, 9. This would consequently be the Ionian colonization. Acc. to Str. 14, 633, Chios was founded by Egertius with a mixed population, cf. 14, 645. Chian traditions were recited by the poet Ion of Chios. Cf. Poppo, Beitr. zur Kunde der Insel Chios, Frkft. 1822 ; J. Kofod Whitte, De rebus Chiorum, Cop. 1838 ; A. Vlastos, Chiaka, Hermup. 1840 ; Alimonakis, Chios, Erl. 1882.

Samos. Str. 14, 633 (founder Tembrion) 636-639 ; Paus. 2, 13, 2 ; 7, 4, 1 seq. Panofka, Res Samiorum, Berl. 1822. Researches by French, English, and Germans : Guérin, Description de l'île de Patmos et de l'île de Samos, Par. 1856 ; Bull. de corres. hellén. 1880 ; Gardner, Samos and Samian coins, Lond. 1882 (Num. Chron.) ; E. Fabricius, Alterth. auf d. Insel Samos, M. d. arch. Inst. in Athen, 1884; various articles by Curtius on Samian Inscr. (esp. Schulprogr. of Wesel 1873 and Lübeck 1877).

Phocaea. Paus. 7, 3, 10 ; Str. 14, 633, 647 ; 6, 252. Tisquen, Phocaica, Bonn, 1842 ; Papadopulus, Phoc. Sm. 1879. This city had an important coinage.

17. Founding of the Dorian colonies, Str. 14, 653 : μετὰ τὴν Κόδρου τελευτήν. Cf. Herod. 1, 144, 145.

Rhodes. Diod. 5, 59 ; Con. narr. 47 ; Strabo 14, 652 seq., according to whom (654) the Rhodians undertook distant voyages before the beginning of the Olympiads ; Aristid. 1, 839 D. Althaemenes, acc. to Diod. 1, 1, is son of King Catreus of Crete, consequently grandson of Minos, and therefore quite a mythical

character. We see again and again how the old genealogists played with the heroes of the legends. Of modern writers cf. Rost, Rhodes, Alt. 1823; Heffter, Götterdienste auf Rhodos, 3 Hefte, Zerbst. 1827 seq.; Menge, Vorgesch. von Rh., Köln, 1827; Guérin, Voy. dans l'île de Rhodes, Par. 1856; Berg, Die Insel Rhodus, 1862; Schneiderwirth, Gesch. der Insel Rh., Heiligenst. 1868; Rottermund, De rep. Rhod. Hal. 1882; Torr, Rhodes in Anc. Times, Cambr. 1885. Important excavations have recently been made at Rhodes by Salzmann, which are not yet fully published—La nécrop. de Camiras (planches) 1871. The results (vases, &c.) are mostly in the British Museum.—Acc. to Paus. 7, 2, 2, the Theban Theras conducted a body of Lacedaemonians and Minyae to the island of Calliste (henceforth called Thera) a γενεά before the Dorian invasion. For the colonization of Rhodes see Lüders in the Ztschr. f. A. 1852.

Cnidus. Triopas, Herod. 1, 174; Str. 14, 656; Diod. 5, 53, 61. Cf. Ionian Antiquities, III., London, 1840, and the work of Newton quoted under Halicarnassus. Cnidians colonized Lipara and Corcyra Nigra in Illyria.

Halicarnassus. Herod. 1, 144; 7, 99; Str. 14, 656; Paus. 2, 30, 9; St. B. h. v. On the position and antiquities of the city (now Budrum) cf. C. T. Newton, A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus, and the Branchidae, Lond. 1862; for the inscription see C.I.Gr. 2655 (Ditt. 372).—Mindus also, to the west of Halicarnassus, was Dorian.

Cos. Herod. 7, 99; Str. 14, 657; Diod. 5, 57, 81; Paus. 2, 26, 3; Plut. Qu. Gr. 58; Ath. 15, 688. Zander, Beitr. z. Kunde d. Insel Kos, Hamb. 1831; Küster, De Co ins. Hal. 1833; Dubois, De Co insula, Par. 1884; and esp. Paton and Hicks, The Inscriptions of Cos, Cambr. 1891.

18. Crete. Odyss. 19, 177. Tectamus, son of Dorus, came to Crete, Diod. 4, 60; cf. fuller accounts, Diod. 5, 64 seq. Althaemenes from Argos, Pollis from Laconia, Str. 10, 474 seq.; Plut. Qu. Gr. 21; Plat. Leg. 4, 707. Cf. above, p. 99.

19. The Asiatic colonies lie directly opposite the parent-cities. Thus a Dorian sphere is formed in the south, an Ionian in the middle, and an Aeolian in the north, each of which includes a piece of the Asiatic coast, some islands, and a part of European Greece.

20. Primitive Greek settlements in Cyprus, Theop. fr. 111 M.; Herod. 5, 113; 7, 90 (Salamis, Athens, Arcadia, and Cythnus); Str. 14, 681; Plut. Sol. 26; Paus. 8, 5, 2 (Arc.). The Arcadian settlement is remarkable, see below.

21. What was known of Cyprus in old days can be found in

Engel, Cyprus, 2 vols. 1841. The excavations in Cyprus have been chiefly made by Gen. P. di Cesnola, by Colonna Ciccaldi and by Lang; the British Government now carries on excavations by the agency of Ohnefalsch-Richter. The results of the various excavations are treated in the publications of Gen. Cesnola (Cyprus, and Descriptive Atlas of the Cesnola collection), of his brother A. di Cesnola (Salaminia, 1882), of Doell (St. Petersburg, Die Samml. Cesnola, 1873), of Newton and Colvin (Antiquities of Cyprus, 1873) and of Ohnefalsch-Richter. Gen. Cesnola's veracity is subject to grave doubt. The so-called treasure of Curium is said to be spurious. The deciphering of Cypriote writing is chiefly due to G. Smith, Brandis, Deecke, Siegismund and M. Schmidt. The collections of Cypriote antiquities are mostly in New York, London and Paris. The most detailed account of the art and culture of Cyprus is given in the third volume of Perrot et Chipiez, Histoire de l'Art, Paris, 1885. Cf. P. Gardner, New Chapters, ch. vi., Ancient Cyprus, where we can see how little is known for certain of the early history of Cyprus, in spite of all the discoveries. Very remarkable is the close connection between the Cypriote Greek and the Arcadian dialect; actually a confirmation of a legend!

22. We must in conclusion again point out the uncertainty of the facts related in this chapter. When we consider (1) that, according to Herodotus, the Dorians were first called Dorians instead of Macedonians when they came to Dryopis, thus making the Dorians and Macedonians one and the same people; (2) that Plato holds that the Achaeans were called Dorians after a leader Dorias, and so makes no difference between Achaeans and Dorians; (3) that Hellanicus brings Orestes to Lesbos, although the latter was not expelled by the Dorians, and consequently does not consider that the Aeolian colonization of Asia Minor was a consequence of the Dorian invasion, we come to the conclusion that the ancients in the fifth century had no authentic information respecting this invasion and the founding of the colonies in Asia, and that the history related to and by us is nothing but the most favourite version of an obscure event. Whether this version is more correct than others we do not know. Beloch, Die dor. Wanderung, Rh. Mus. 41, pp. 555-598, endeavours to prove it on other grounds. Moreover, he flatly denies the conquest of the Peloponnese by the Dorians. Beloch has been able to show that the Dorian invasion is not proved by the ancient authorities; but he has not shown that it is impossible, not even that it is improbable. On the contrary, it is probable; the whole of Greek history shows this. Historical criticism must be on its guard against confounding two things: the demonstration that a fact held to be historical cannot

be proved to be such, and the demonstration that it is impossible. A thing that cannot be conclusively proved must not on that account be denied, or there would be no facts whatever bearing on the history of civilization before B.C. 700. The Dorian invasion belongs precisely to this class of events.

CHAPTER XIII

CIVILIZATION OF THE ASIATIC GREEKS. HOMERIC POETRY

WHAT information so far have we had to impart concerning the Greeks? We have spoken of their arrival in the country which remained their home, of their legends, of their religion, and of the great changes in the geographical distribution of their chief races. We have not been able to find satisfactory accounts of their other doings, while the traces of their civilization are few in number, though of some importance, and yet not of such a kind as to warrant a claim to any permanent typical value. The next historical fact presented to us by Greek development marks an astonishing revolution. The Greek race suddenly produces two poems, which in spite of all defects must be regarded, both in form and contents, as the most perfect specimens of narrative poetry which have ever been composed. The Iliad and Odyssey represent men in a simple state of civilization. Their passions always seem to be aroused by good motives, while the nobler sentiments have hardly ever found so simple and at the same time so perfect an expression as in the persons of Achilles, Patroclus, Hector, Andromache, Penelope, Telemachus and Eumaeus. The poetic form is excellent; the hexameter is one of the most perfect of metres. It possesses sufficient variety not to weary the reader, and this variety is well suited to the different keys in which the narrative is pitched. In short, both contents and form make the Iliad and Odyssey models of narrative poetry.

How can we explain the appearance of such perfect works in a period when general culture lagged so far behind? And how can we account for the contents themselves of these poems? Unfortunately we must confess that only a conjectural reply can be given to the second question, while it is impossible to answer the first even to this extent.

The Homeric poems are a product of Aeolic-Ionian culture, which has itself sprung from various roots. The Greeks who landed in Asia Minor found most of the towns where they settled already inhabited, and had to establish themselves in their new homes by force. In the far north they vanquished the Teucri or Dardani, who lived upon the slopes of Mount Ida; in the south the Mysians, the Lycians and the Carians. Farther in the interior lived the Phrygians. Of these races the Mysians and the Teucri are but little known historically; the days of Carian supremacy had gone by. From the Carians, indeed, the Greeks derived many elements of external civilization, but scarcely anything beyond this. On the other hand, the Lydians and Phrygians possess historical individuality; both nations have also been connected with the Greek legends.

The Lydians, originally called Maeonians by the Greeks,[1] were at first ruled over by Atys, son of the god Manes, from whom the first dynasty of Lydian kings were descended. Atys had two sons—Lydus and Torrhebus (or Tyrsenus), after whom the Lydians and Torrhebus (or Tyrsenians) were named. The Tyrsenians of Italy have been brought into connection with these Tyrsenians of Lydia. The town of Ascalon became a Lydian colony through Ascalus, a Lydian who was sent on a mission to Syria.[2] In later times we meet with Iardanos and his daughter the famous Omphale in Lydia. Near the kingdom of Sardis at the foot of Mount Sipylus was the legendary realm of Tantalus. The Atyadae were followed by a new race of rulers, the Heraclidae, through Alcaeus, son of Heracles.[3] These Heraclidae ruled over Lydia for 505 years.[4]

The Lydians worshipped chiefly a sun-god, in whom the Greeks recognized their own Apollo. Many of the customs of the Lydians suggest the conjecture that they were Semites, a hypothesis confirmed by the appearance of Lud among the sons of Shem in Genesis. On the other hand, Lydia was closely connected with the Phrygians, who belong to the Aryan race, and hence the traces of Semitism in Lydia may be due to foreign, perhaps Hittite influence.[5]

Farther in the interior the territory of the Phrygians stretched westwards from the Halys and the central desert of Asia Minor; it was mainly a high table-land, but intersected on two sides by large rivers—the Sangarius on the north and the Maeander on the west. According to the opinion of many of the ancients the Phrygians came from Europe, where the Brigae of Thrace still recall the name. In more modern times some writers have suggested that the relations were reversed, and that the emigration flowed from Asia to Europe. The scanty remnants of the Phrygian language place it among the Aryan tongues. The Phrygian heroes are Gordius and Midas; the chariot of the former and the wealth of the latter were celebrated. The whispering of the reeds in the legend of Midas reminds us of the Phrygian flute, which was contrasted with the cithara and lyre of the Greeks. The chief Phrygian deity was Manes, but more famous was their chief goddess Cybele or Dindymene, whom the Greeks named Rhea. To her the lion was sacred. The most celebrated temple of Rhea was at Pessinus.[6]

While the Lydians and Phrygians may be regarded as neighbours of the Aeolians, Ionians and Dorians, this is less the case with another race of Asia Minor, who however must often have come into contact with them, since they are mentioned in the Iliad—the Lycians.[7] This nation, whose real name was Termiles, were natives of the mountainous region which runs into the sea to the east of Rhodes. The legends connect them with Crete, whence Sarpedon came, and with

Attica, the native place of Lycus, son of Pandion. The Corinthian Bellerophon was sent by Proetus to Lycia, where he fought with the Chimaera. The grandchildren of Bellerophon were the cousins Glaucus and Sarpedon, who rendered help to the Trojans. In Lycia Apollo was chiefly honoured, and the Greeks said that he passed the winter in Lycia and delivered oracles in Patara. The Lycian language is probably Aryan. A peculiarity of the Lycians was the special value attached to descent on the mother's side. Their towns were surrounded by strong walls, built of unhewn stone; the walls of Tiryns were, according to the legend, erected by Lycian Cyclopes. Their tombs, hewn in the solid rock, lay inside the towns. The Lycians remained for centuries a brave and pious people, and it is probable that they exercised considerable influence upon the Greeks, especially the Asiatic Greeks.

The Asiatic peoples have in many respects provided the elements which the Greeks turned to account in their splendid creations—religion and the fine arts prove it. But poetry can hardly be counted as one of them; at least thus far nothing has been discovered which can be regarded as a connecting link between Asiatic and Greek poetry. In this point the old view of the originality of the Greeks remains unshaken. The simplicity of the Homeric poetry precludes the hypothesis that its origin was due to Lydian or Phrygian influence, and Lycia is an unknown factor in this respect. Thus the origin of the Homeric poems remains the problem which it has always been. They must have been part and parcel of the inner nature of the Aeolian and Ionian Greeks. And their perfection necessitates the assumption of a previous period of development in the poetic art in Greece, and especially in Aeolis and Ionia.

The earliest poetry had a religious character: it consisted of hymns sung to the gods. These hymns must at an early date have acquired an artistic form. The Muses, originally deities of the springs, became the goddesses of poetry. Their

worship appears to have developed in the most northerly parts of Thessaly, on the slopes of Olympus among the Thracian people. The Thracian Orpheus was counted the first poet; Musaeus belonged to Attica; Thamyris again was considered a Thracian. If they wrote poetry at all, they wrote it in the form of hymns. But narrative poetry, at first songs in praise of the heroes, existed quite early. Homer mentions some; he makes Demodocus and Phemius sing of the wooden horse, of Ares and Aphrodite, and of the return of the Achaeans. The stereotyped epithets in Homer, which are not always explainable by the text, prove that the heroes were known to his audience by certain peculiar characteristics, and this could only have been effected by means of poems. Poems of any length, however, do not appear to have existed before the time of Homer.

But was there ever really a Homer? Are not the Homeric poems as a whole the product of a much later period? This question has been much discussed during the last hundred years.[8] F. A. Wolf has emphasized the external difficulties which stand in the way of the theory that poems of the extent of the Iliad and Odyssey could have been composed in the ninth century B.C., at a time when there was so little writing in Greece. K. Lachmann has advanced from negative to positive criticism, and has pointed out that in a great part of the Iliad certain joints may be detected, which lead to the conclusion that in these places poems have been joined together which were formerly separate. The existence of joints of this description can be demonstrated by contradictions in details, and by defective continuations of what has been announced as about to follow. Other scholars have criticised the subject-matter of the Iliad and Odyssey principally from an aesthetic point of view, and often with success, for it is indisputable that Homer contains much that is pointless and insipid, and much that is purely mechanical compilation. Lachmann came to the conclusion that the poems, of which he had demonstrated

the original independent existence, were composed by different persons, and that the Homeric epic was what is called popular poetry, excluding poets by profession, so that the single compositions were from the first anonymous. This theory has its doubtful side. If the poetry of art and the poetry of the people can be contrasted, we do not know for certain of any difference between them in those days. But the particular observations upon which Lachmann builds his theory retain their value, even if the theory itself falls to the ground. For even if the Homeric epic did not originally consist of the separate poems above described, it soon came to be divided into separate poems. They were circulated not by reading or by reading aloud, but by recitation from memory. The people listened to single parts, which, even if they were originally portions of a larger whole, must have undergone such a change by this separate recital that each soon became a distinct whole, which did not always fully harmonize with the others. When the Homeric poems were pieced together, as is said to have been done for instance in the sixth century by command of Pisistratus at Athens, traces of this gradual separation into distinct parts may very well have remained. The joints which can be proved to exist in the Iliad do not therefore necessarily confirm the theory of single poems. The plan which unmistakeably pervades the whole points to the contrary. The wrath of Achilles really forms the inner unity of the Iliad, the nucleus of which may have been expanded in many directions. In the same way the Odyssey forms a complete well-ordered whole, the conception of which must be sought in the mind of a single person, although there is no lack of enlargement even here.

If we accept an original Iliad and an original Odyssey and therefore concede the existence of Homer, we must also assume a single Homer, and not two with the Chorizontes. For in that case there would have been two personalities, each with strongly-marked characteristics, which would not easily blend

into one. Each of the two poets would have had his friends and his disciples, and how could the one have been so completely absorbed into the other? A crowd of minor poets may remain nameless; two equally great ones retain their individuality. The difference of tone in the Iliad and Odyssey is caused by the difference of subject-matter. In the former the events of the war are treated, in the latter are portrayed journeys, fabulous countries, marvellous beings, and events which happen in a small community partaking more of the character of the country than of the town.[9]

The birthplace of the sublime poet was a subject of inquiry in antiquity, and seven cities disputed for the honour: Smyrna, Chios, Colophon, Ithaca (or Cyme), Pylos, Argos, and Athens. Ithaca, Pylos, and Argos were mentioned because of their heroes, Athens on account of the revision undertaken by Pisistratus; Homer's mother came, it was said, from Cyme; and he had lived at Colophon and still more in Chios; but he was born, as most writers believed, in Smyrna. And Smyrna fits in with the language of Homer, which is Ionic supplemented by Aeolic, and not a popular dialect. Smyrna's position is also appropriate, for it lay on the boundaries of Aeolis and Ionia, and was an object of strife between the two.

Opinion was no less divided with regard to the date of Homer. Herodotus places him in the middle of the ninth century B.C. His personality, that is, his blindness, his wanderings throughout the world, and his grave in the tiny island of Ios are purely mythical.

The poetry of Homer has an Ionic character. As far as subsequent conditions enable us to judge of the original differences in the national character of the Aeolians and Ionians in Asia Minor, there was a greater tendency to epic poetry among the latter. An epic poem deals with the events of the great world. At a subsequent period the Ionians showed a decided bias towards practical and scientific intercourse with the world. Just as they were always eager to learn

something new in later times, so they were ready to listen to it at the beginning of their history. Hence their sympathy with epic poetry. If up to that time poetry had been chiefly cultivated in the north of Greece, we can understand how a man of Aeolian birth—for Smyrna was at that time Aeolian —living among Ionians, could raise epic poetry to so high a standard. But the selection of the material for the two great poems is also explained by the supposed conditions of the poet's life. The Iliad, judging by its subject-matter, seems to have taken rise on Aeolian soil. The story is of a war of the Achaeans against the Trojans. If such a war really took place against Troy in olden times, the Aeolians settled in the Troad were in the best position to know the legends which were current about it. And if there never was such a war, Troy had none the less always been in Aeolian territory. By way of explanation of the story of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon the circumstance may be of importance, that the Thessalian Magnetes, whose representative was Achilles, penetrated farthest into Asia Minor, as the position of the two cities of Magnesia shows. The poet personifies their daring in Achilles.[10] The Aeolians, who took possession of an entire district in Asia, would thus supply a foundation of fact for an epic of battle and conquest. On the other hand, the Odyssey represents life in the peaceful times following on the warlike age, which made its consequences felt in civil disturbances and distant voyages. The Ionian mind has left its mark on this epoch. The Ionians were confined to the edge of the coast-line of Asia Minor, and behind them stretched great kingdoms from which they could not wrest any territory. Thus they turned their attention once more towards the sea over which they had come. In the sea-port towns of Ionia marvellous tales of foreign lands found eager listeners. And hence arose the stories and fables in which the Odyssey originated.

NOTES

1. Maeones, Il. 10, 431 ; 18, 291. Lydian history cf. Herod. 1, 7, where the 505 years of the Heraclidae are mentioned. The Lydians, Mysians, and Carians were related acc. to Herod. 1, 171. Cf. further, G. Meyer, Die Karier in Bezenberger's Beiträge, Bd. X., and the exhaustive work of Radet, La Lydie et le monde grec, 687-546, Par. 1893 ; also Ramsay's Historical Geography of Asia Minor, Lond. 1890, and P. Gardner, New Chapters, Ch. II.

2. Xanthus, fr. 11, 23. Acc. to Meyer, G. d. A., § 256, it was a reminiscence of the war between the Lydians and the Chetites. Tyrsenus goes to Umbria, Herod. 1, 94.

3. Acc. to Herod. 1, 7, through Ninus, son of Bel. But Lydia had no connection with Assyria at so early a date ; probably with the Chetites (Hittites).

4. For criticism of the dates of Lydian history, Meyer, G. d. A., § 413, and esp. R. Schubert, Geschichte der Könige von Lydien, 1884.

5. The so-called Heraclidae in Lydia were perhaps Hittites, cf. Meyer, § 400.

6. Meyer, G. d. A., §§ 252, 253. We think it probable that there were in Asia Minor : (1) an Aryan population, (2) a Semitic, which presses on and breaks through the former — to which many writers add a primitive population neither Aryan nor Semitic. The common elements of the religions of Asia Minor are noted by Meyer, G. d. A., §§ 253, 254.

7. Descendants of Glaucus reigned in Ionia, acc. to Herod. 1, 142-144. Bachofen has made good use of passages from ancient authors and modern travels bearing on Lycia in his Das lykische Volk, Freib. 1862. In addition to the works of travel of the present century, *e.g.* those of Ch. Fellows, which have all been epitomized by Ritter, Asia Minor, II. 716-1200, our knowledge of Lycia has of late been considerably increased by the Austrian expeditions, the results of which have been published in a preliminary report in an article by O. Benndorf, Vorl. Bericht über zwei österreichische archäologische Expeditionen nach Kleinasien in Archäol. Mittheil. aus Oesterreich, VI. 151 seq. ; an exhaustive work has been commenced by Benndorf und Niemann, Reisen in Lykien und Karien, 1 vol., Wien, 1884.—Cf. Meyer, G. d. A., § 252 ; O. Treuber, Geschichte der Lykier, Stuttg. 1887, and his Beiträge zur Geschichte der Lykier, I. II., Tüb. 1888.

8. As a guide to the questions involved, cf. H. Bonitz, Ueber

den Ursprung der homerischen Gedichte, 5 Aufl. von R Neubauer, Wien, 1881 ; F. A. Wolf, Prolegomena ad Homerum, Hal. 1795 ; C. Lachmann, Betrachtungen über Homer's Ilias, Berl. 1847 ; and a little-noticed contribution by A. Holm, De Iliadis compositione, Lüb. 1853 (Schulprogr.) The Odyssey has been criticized in an analytic spirit by Koechly, Kirchhoff, and Kayser ; by the opposite school, but with important concessions, by Grote and Kammer. Cf. finally, B. Niese, Die Entwickelung der homerischen Poesie, Berl. 1882, and v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Homerische Untersuchungen (Philol. Unters. by Kiessling and von W.-M., siebentes Heft). E. Rohde, in the Rh. Mus. 1881, has contested with some acumen M. Sengebusch's chronological conclusions in the Homericae dissertationes.

9. Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff in his Homerische Untersuchungen defends the Chorizontes. In reality, however, he asserts that, with the exception of some parts of the Iliad, all the rest, including the Odyssey and the so-called Cyclic poets, are a flight of steps without any landing. This makes Homer the author of only some parts of the Iliad. But what right have we to look upon Homer as merely the author of certain sections of the Iliad ? For antiquity, Homer was the representative, first of the whole epico-cyclic poetry, and then of the Iliad and Odyssey. For us he either has no existence whatever, or he is the author of the finest passages in the Iliad and Odyssey. But there is no reason why we should credit him only with fragments of the Iliad. To pick out fragments of this kind, to call Homer their author, and then to say that other passages which do not correspond in language, etc., are not Homeric—for this there is on justification. As we do not know Homer's personality, and cannot say with any approach to certainty what he wrote, his name has only a symbolical signification for us. The creator of Telemachus, of Nausicaa, and of Eumaeus, has as much right to the name of Homer as the poet of the fortunes of Achilles and Patroclus. It is true that antiquity even in the fifth century gave a broader meaning to the word Homeric than we do ; but it is equally true that the eternally beautiful types of character belong only to the realm of the Iliad and Odyssey ; and hence they are truly Homeric. The other heroes were necessary for the purposes of the drama. In conclusion, we should like to emphasize one point. We shall never know whether Homer existed, who he was, or what he really did or did not write ; but we shall be able to agree as to what is really Homeric in spirit.

10. Duncker, G. d. Alt. 5, 321.

CHAPTER XIV

INSTITUTIONS AND MODE OF LIFE OF THE EARLY GREEKS, ESPECIALLY AS DESCRIBED IN HOMER

THE civilization of the Aeolians and Ionians was evidently the same as that of the surroundings which they had left, but altered and enlarged by their residence in a new country and their close intercourse with the nations of Asia Minor. It must not be imagined that the high state of culture, revealed by the appearance of the Homeric poems, was something entirely new, standing out in contrast to the state of the parent country. The skill in art exhibited by Mycenae and Orchomenus discloses a comparatively high standard of civilization. This was of course still further raised by the stimulating effect of their life in Asia Minor. It is clear that one of the most important consequences of the Dorian invasion of the Peloponnese was that the development of the Greek nation, then in course of progress upon European soil, was only interrupted in particular parts of European Greece, and was continued in that country to which the Achaeans and Ionians had migrated. In point of fact it would be a grave mistake to imagine that more genuine Greek elements must have existed in the pre-Doric culture of European Greece than in Asia Minor after the migration. It is true that we cannot compare literature with literature and art with art; but we can see that, while the pre-Doric art in Europe was not continued in later times, and the later genuine Greek

art follows other paths than those of Mycenae and Orchomenus, the earliest poetry of Asia Minor is still the truest expression of Greek life that exists. The art of Mycenae, which was developed in Europe, has in it more oriental character than the Homeric poetry which was produced in Asia. Thus, as regards literature also, the Aeolians and Ionians who migrated to Asia must have brought with them much of the spirit of their native land. The knowledge of this fact enables us to decide another important question.

The Homeric poems are a rich and much-used store for our knowledge of the institutions and the mode of life of the Greeks before the Dorian invasion. But all who have used them for this purpose have been confronted with a great difficulty. Homer wanted to give a picture of the past, but was he able to do so? In an age when learning was unknown, it was impossible to draw distinctions between the life of the present and that of the past which it was desired to describe. Homer had to paint the past in the colours with which his own times supplied him. Then how is it possible to make use of the Homeric descriptions for the times of Agamemnon and Odysseus? The remarks made above supply the answer. If it is true that the Aeolic-Ionian culture of the tenth century B.C. is nothing but a somewhat modified continuation of the pre-Doric culture of European Greece, then the life in Smyrna and Chios in Homer's time was but little different from that in Mycenae and Orchomenus two hundred years earlier. The Achaean and Ionian emigrants had no inducement to live a very different life in Asia to that of their native land. They must have been inclined to preserve the customs and ideas which they had previously possessed, and there was no reason for altering the political constitution to which they were accustomed. Hence the main features of the Homeric narrative may serve for the age which it purports to represent, and may generally be regarded as typical of the

condition of early Greece. In this sense we take them as a basis for the following sketch.[1]

The usual form of government in the States of Greece appears to have been a monarchy. It was regarded as a divine institution, but the greatest nobles were also called kings. This alone precludes the monarchy from being absolute. The nobles standing next to the king in rank formed the aristocracy. The people, or Demos, were by no means despised. Honourable epithets were given even to persons of the rank of bondsmen: the godlike swineherd Eumaeus was famous. Thus everywhere the worth of the individual was recognized, and this truly human relationship between high and low imparted an aspect of refinement to the Greek character even in the earliest times.[2] All important affairs were discussed with the nobles.[3] The deliberations were often conducted by the king and the elders during the banquets; the religious ceremony of sacrifice also accompanied every banquet. The assemblies of the people were not like those of later times, in which formal decisions had to be taken. The people were summoned to take note of the deliberations of the elders, and to invest them with authority by their approval. If the people plainly announced their approval, the nobles had attained their object; but if they left the place of assembly without expressing assent, yet without openly displaying dissatisfaction, it was equivalent to a motion to pass to the order of the day which signifies to a modern parliamentary government that the assembly declines to follow it any farther.[4] Any one desiring to speak in the assembly of the people had a sceptre put into his hand by a herald; as a rule only the nobles spoke. The king is judge and general; he offers sacrifice in the name of the people.

The royal office was by custom hereditary; even daughters were able to succeed to the throne. The king had a private domain (Temenos); he received gifts and taxes, the lion's

share of booty of war, and larger portions at the feasts. We do not hear of any particular royal ornament. The sceptre as an ensign of dignity was carried also by priests and heralds, and by speakers in the assembly of the people. The priests are the servants of one definite god. Slaves were generally designated as *dmoes*, conquered, or *oikees*, domestic servants. Free paid labourers were called *thetes*. Handicraft was held in esteem. The craftsmen, together with the heralds, singers, and doctors, belong to the so-called class of Demiurgi—or workers for the people. Even the children of princes put their hand to work. Nausicaa superintends the washing of the royal linen.

The most costly objects came from abroad, through Phoenicians, chiefly traders from Sidon. The Greeks of Homer shrank from long voyages and not without reason. Piracy was in full swing, and was not considered dishonourable in itself, as is shown by the well-known question addressed to strangers. Legal relations existed only between members of the same state; the stranger was inviolable in his quality of guest. In the country every district had its lord, and thus every stranger had a protector; but the sea had no master, and there might was right.

The laws were under the protection of Zeus. The State however was not under any obligation to punish crimes, especially murder; it was the duty of the relations of the murdered person to avenge his death. They were as a rule satisfied when the murderer had paid a sufficient fine. The idea of blood-guiltiness, which could be removed by religious ceremonies, did not yet exist. In marriage monogamy was the rule. The father of the bride received a price or demanded certain services, but she herself also received a dowry. Princes sometimes provided special teachers for their sons, as Peleus put Achilles under the charge of Phoenix. Achilles besides learned music from the centaur Cheiron. Music was practised, as in the Middle Ages, at courts or in castles

by permanent or wandering *aoidoi* or singers. Music combined with the recitation of the great exploits of the heroes served not merely as entertainment, but also as an incentive to all that was good for youth. The festivals were simple; worship of the dead and of heroes was introduced, as it appears, later into Greece. Human sacrifice is not mentioned in Homer. Gifts of dedication were chiefly arms taken from the enemy. There were sooth-sayers, like Calchas and Helenus. They were informed of the will of the gods by signs, divined from the flight of birds, from sacrifices, and from dreams, but they at times recognized the will of the gods without any such external aids. The oracles at Dodona and Pytho (Delphi) are mentioned.

The Greeks possessed fortified cities,[5] but their prosperity depended upon the land and its products. Prices were fixed in cattle; cultivation of the vine and fruit gardens are mentioned; hunting was carried on with zest by the nobles, but not fishing. As regards the arrangement of the houses, we have accurate information only of the dwellings of kings, as those of Alcinous and Odysseus. The principal apartment is the Melathron, in which, as in the halls of the castles of the Middle Ages, family and guests met together, and the housewife had her seat by the hearth. The luxury in the palace of Alcinous is partly of a fanciful character. In the towns, where they had not much work to do, people spent their time in the streets, in the market-place or in the Leschae, as in southern countries at the present day, where the casinoes, the apothecaries' shops and the cafés take the place of the Leschae. It is the cheerful Ionic life which is portrayed in the Odyssey, and this cheerfulness find its way into their religion, as is shown by the story of Ares and Aphrodite.

In the Iliad we see the warlike life of the ancient Greeks. The most remarkable thing in it is the chariot-fighting. The war-chariot comes from the East, as the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments show, and in the extensive plains of

these countries it is an appropriate engine of war. How far it came into general use in Greece itself, is not known, for racing purposes probably quite early, but hardly for purposes of war.

The Iliad also supplies information as to the burial of prominent heroes: the funeral pile, the urn for holding the ashes, its covering of stone and finally the mound which was heaped over the grave. We can still see on the coast of the Troad conical mounds which according to tradition were the tombs of heroes.

NOTES

1. Colonists have elsewhere also faithfully preserved the civilization of the home country, as the French in Canada. For what follows cf. the excellent summary in Schömann's Griech. Alterth. I. p. 20 seq., also the usual works on Homeric antiquities, and as a new presentation of a special province of them, W. Helbig, Das homerische Epos aus den Denkmälern erläutert, Lpz. 1884. Cf. Mahaffy, Problems in Greek History, p. 46 seq. The question, how far Homeric culture can be illustrated by the still extant remains of Greek art, is treated by P. Gardner, New Chapters, Ch. V. We must not look to Corinthian vases, or Phoenician goblets, but to Mycenean works of art to find anything corresponding to Homer. At p. 146 P. Gardner accepts the view, taken by Dörpfeld and others, of the different arrangement of the apartments in the palace of Tiryns and in the house of Odysseus. In my opinion, however, it is not probable that that part of the palace of Tiryns, which is regarded as a suite of female apartments, was really such, in which case the apparent discrepancy in the plan of the two palaces falls to the ground.

2. The only dark side to the picture is the indifference to the sacrifice of human life. As it was in the Iliad and Odyssey, so was it in later Greece. Antiquity has none of our modern sentimentality.

3. There has been a tendency quite lately to think that the somewhat restricted monarchy depicted by Homer is not the genuine Homeric monarchy, because the important works belonging to that age, *e.g.* at Mycenae, point to a régime of great splendour, and hence, as it is supposed, involve greater monarchical power. But, in the first place, the splendour of the court of Alcinous was quite

consistent, in the opinion of the ancients, with considerable influence on the part of the nobles, the existence of which was consequently not impossible even in Mycenae. Secondly, in small communities of a nation so highly gifted as the Greeks, an absolute monarchy is not likely to have been the first historical stage in their institutions. The council of wise elders must always have had weight. Absolute monarchy is only possible in large states as a regular institution, not in the Greek cantons.

4. The Athenians especially became afterwards very expert in the framing of forms for giving effect to resolutions in public affairs. With advancing education and the consequent increased possibility of reducing to written expression the legal ideas embodied in the popular conscience, the fixing of constitutional forms becomes a necessity. Still their absence in earlier times does not prove the powerlessness of the masses.

5. The well-known reference in Thuc. 1, 5, 6 to the πόλεσιν ἀτειχίστοις need not lead us astray; it is one-sided, and, if taken literally, certainly incorrect. The fortification of dwelling-places is too obvious a matter. People make their walls or barricades or ramparts as best they can, but they do make them; even savages do so after a fashion. Moreover, the Middle Ages show that σιδηροφορεῖν does not imply unfortified cities. Helbig, Das homer. Epos, p. 71, denies that stone-walls are consistent with Homeric ideas, but, as it seems to me, on insufficient grounds. Dörpfeld has recently shown that it is probable that the earlier Greeks made an extensive use of sun-dried bricks in building (Historische und philolog. Aufsätze, Ernst Curtius gewidmet Berl. 1884).

CHAPTER XV

EUROPEAN GREECE: SPARTA; THE CONSTITUTION OF LYCURGUS; CUSTOMS OF THE SPARTANS

THE Greek life of the earliest period commenced its growth in European Greece, and then rose to a grand height in Asia Minor, where the Greek cities brought the civilization of the mother-country to a rare pitch of development. But although these Asiatic Greeks were distinguished from the very first by intellectual progress, and subsequently accomplished great things in commerce and in science, in politics they always remained insignificant. We never find a trace of military force based on a combination of several individuals, nor a single community characterized by real political or military power. The cities fell one by one into the hands of the Lydians, and then under the power of Persia. The development of political ideas is the glory of the European Greeks, and in the first place of the Dorians.

We have discussed the traditions concerning the settlement of the Dorians in the Peloponnese, and have seen how much uncertainty clings to them. The most information we have of early times refers to the Spartan state; but even this is contradictory and obscure.[1]

According to Ephorus, Eurysthenes and Procles divided Laconia into six parts, of which they handed over Amyclae to Philonomus, an Achaean, who had betrayed his people to the Dorians. The equality of rights granted to the conquered was annulled by Agis, son of Eurysthenes, and they became

subjects liable to payment of tribute. The inhabitants of Helos would not submit, and were reduced to slavery. Philonomus had besides settled some Lemnians in Amyclae; they were obliged to leave the country and settled in Melos and at Gortyn in Crete. Herodotus connects the settlement of Thera also with these people. Descendants of the Argonauts had settled upon Mount Taygetus with the consent of the Spartans. The Spartans soon grew weary of them, and Theras a Cadmean, brother-in-law of Aristodemus, received permission to take them with other Spartans to Calliste, now known as Thera. Oeolycus, son of Theras, remained behind, and became the founder of the noble house of the Aegidae in Sparta. These legends contain a distinct allusion to an important fact, that Amyclae remained in possession of the Achaeans for a considerable time after the Dorians had become supreme in Sparta. In fact it is expressly stated that King Teleclus of Sparta wrested Amyclae from the Achaeans towards the end of the ninth century. The Aegid Timomachus is said to have rendered important service to the Spartans in this war. Now Amyclae lay not far to the south of Sparta; and so long as this region was not under their immediate control, they could hardly have been in possession of the southern end of the Eurotas valley. It is therefore clear that even after the time of Lycurgus the Spartans were not complete masters of the valley.

In historical times the Spartans were always ruled by two kings, sprung from two different families, the Agiadae and Eurypontidae. These families were said to be descended from the twin sons of Aristodemus, Eurysthenes and Procles, and to have received their name from Agis, son of Eurysthenes, and Eurypon, grandson of Procles. By the decision of the Delphic oracle, both brothers became king, but as Eurysthenes was supposed to have been born first, the Agiadae were held in greater respect. Modern criticism adopts the correct view that a conquering nation is not likely

to entrust supreme power to two individuals, and interprets the double kingships as a union of communities formerly separate. When the Dorians conquered the Achaeans, they made, so it is said, the concession of allowing an Achaean king to rule side by side with their own, and this state of things continued. Subsequently King Cleomenes declared himself an Achaean at Athens; thus the Agiadae may have been Achaeans and the Eurypontidae Dorians. Or the reverse may be possible: the leading Agiadae may have been Dorians. And, lastly, it is just as probable that the Spartan kings were both of Dorian descent, and only called themselves Achaeans in their assumed character of Heraclidae. This would leave the double kingship unexplained. It may have originated in the tendency to limit the royal power; at all events this was the actual result.[2]

The earliest records of Spartan history state that Eurysthenes was followed by Agis, Echestratus, Labotas, Doryssus, Agesilaus, Archelaus, and Teleclus; and Procles by Sous, Eurypon, Prytanis, Eunomus, Polydectus, and Charilaus. Of these Echestratus was said to have conquered Cynuria, the country between Mount Parnon and the Aegean; Sous subjugated Helos and fought against the Arcadian city of Cleitor; Eurypon made himself master of Mantinea; Prytanis and Charilaus fought against the Argives, at which time Charilaus was taken prisoner by the Tegeatae. This account is not free from improbabilities. How could the Spartans have become involved in a war with Cleitor, a town quite in the north of Arcadia, so early as this? Even the war with Mantinea is improbable. These military exploits are only conceivable on the assumption that they took place during the migration of the Dorians into Laconia.[3] On the other hand, the struggle for Cynuria is probably historical; it is a frontier province, and they are always disputed by powerful states.

The light which breaks upon the beginnings of Spartan history with Lycurgus is more apparent than real. There are

plenty of statements about his life and his actions, but they vary so much that we cannot arrive at any certainty with regard to the most essential points.[4] The life of Lycurgus is so much anterior to any kind of written history that there was time enough for oral tradition to efface all traces of reality. He gave the Spartans the laws under which they lived. This is the only point on which there is agreement. But tradition differs as to what this legislation really was. The greatest discrepancies occur in the circumstances of his life. On one point only is there agreement, that he was the near relative and guardian of a Spartan king who was a minor. The name of this king is usually given as Charilaus, which would make him a Eurypontid, but in Herodotus he is called Leobotas, and is an Agiad. As a rule the constitution of Lycurgus is referred to the initiative of the Pythian oracle, but according to Herodotus the Spartans themselves declared that it was imitated from that of Crete. Lycurgus is credited with journeys to Crete, Egypt, and Chios. He became acquainted with famous men: in Crete with the wise poet Thaletas, in Chios with Homer, whose poems he brought to Greece. He died far from home, according to Ephorus, by a voluntary death from starvation. It has been noticed that Greek tradition has introduced into the life of Lycurgus points of resemblance to that of Solon. In both we find travels, relations with Crete, acquaintance with the Homeric poems, and voluntary exile towards the close of life. The relations of Solon to the Delphic oracle correspond to those of Lycurgus to Delphi and Olympia, where he secured the celebration of the festival by his introduction of the sacred armistice. It is evident that everything in the life of Lycurgus which has a counterpart in that of Solon is more or less uncertain. If we could only be more certain of the details of Solon's life! If the personality of Lycurgus is so nebulous, we cannot expect to learn anything definite about the age in which he lived. The calculations of the genealogies would

point to the first half of the ninth century; according to Thucydides the establishment of the Spartan constitution took place rather more than 400 years before the close of the Peloponnesian War.[5] But was there ever really a lawgiver named Lycurgus? The fact has been called in question. But we may ask whether such a well-planned constitution was not in reality the result of a special act of legislation, which in Greek antiquity would always imply the existence of a law-giver?[6]

A second question is: What did Lycurgus really do for Sparta? According to Herodotus he instituted the military divisions of Enomoties and Triacades, the Syssitia, and the Ephors and Gerontes. Herodotus, therefore, thinks that he was the originator of almost all the peculiarities of the Spartan Republic. But this was by no means the general view of antiquity. Aristotle disagrees with him on an important point when he states that the Ephors were first established by King Theopompus after the time of Lycurgus. The Ephors in fact were not regarded by the ancients in general as having been introduced by Lycurgus. Thus the idea of progressive development enters into the Spartan constitution. If the discrepancies in tradition are considered, and if we bear in mind that the legislation attributed to Lycurgus was certainly not reduced to writing at an early stage, we arrive at the conviction that it is impossible to distinguish what belongs to Lycurgus, what was old Doric, and what is due to the times after Lycurgus. Only one point seems certain, that the work of Lycurgus was the consolidation of the supreme power of an aristocratic warrior caste.[7] It is therefore advisable to describe the constitution of Sparta, as it appeared in historical times, at the same time emphasizing the assertion that it must have had an internal development. In the present day highly ingenious attempts have been made to reconstruct this development in its details, and to discover the historical causes of each supposed step in advance. Pictures of this kind

have the advantage of making the reader take a lively interest in the past.[8] But it will be safer, and for a brief sketch it is more necessary, to mention only the changes in the constitution described by the ancients. In this way we shall get a satisfactory idea of the main points.[9]

The divisions of the population formed the basis of the state.[10] It was divided into three classes: the fully-qualified Dorian citizens, the dependent Perioeci, and the Helots. The Helots[11] dwelt upon the property of the full citizens. It was their duty to attend to the cultivation of the soil, of the products of which they had to hand over a certain amount, while they retained the rest for themselves. They had to be held in check by fear, for their number was considerable, even if the estimates of modern writers (about 200,000 to a total population of 400,000 in Laconia) are untrustworthy. For this purpose a number of Spartan youths were sent from time to time about the country to observe the Helots, and if they should notice any indications of rebellion, to kill the suspected ones. This procedure was called Crypteia.[12] Helots could acquire property, and purchase their liberty in certain circumstances. Since they did not stand in relationship to the person of a Spartan, but to his property, their masters could not liberate their Helots or sell them into foreign slavery at their pleasure. The Helots served in war as shield-bearers or light-armed troops, and in case of necessity even as hoplites. Those who had served as hoplites had a claim to their freedom; but the state at times evaded this obligation. From the liberated Helots arose the class of the so-called Neodamodes. The children of Helots became citizens if they were brought up with young Spartans, that is, if they had enjoyed a Spartan education. This privilege fell chiefly to the lot of illegitimate sons of distinguished Spartans, the so-called Mothaces, to which class Gylippus and Lysander were said to belong. The existence of the Helots was at once the basis of the Spartan state and a perpetual menace to its existence.

The Perioeci formed the next higher class of inhabitants.[13] They were spread over the greater part of Spartan territory, and lived in towns, to the number, it was said, of about a hundred. They were the conquered aborigines, Achaeans, Ionians (in Cynuria), Arcadians and Dorians (in Messenia). They carried on agriculture, commerce, and manufactures. In the army they served as hoplites, and could attain to posts of command. Spartan Harmosts supervised them in their towns.

Finally, the citizens with full rights were the Spartiatae, consisting of the descendants of the Dorian conquerors and of the few families received by the Dorians into the circle of rulers. The number of these full citizens grew smaller and smaller in course of time. During the Persian wars there were as many as 9000; when Agis III. succeeded to the throne there were only 700. Among them some of them were designated as Homoioi, the equals, others as Hypomeiones, the lesser ones.[14] Those who had not enjoyed the Spartan training, or who had not paid their contributions to the Syssitia, could not enjoy full civic rights. For the rest, perfect equality prevailed among the Spartiatae. It was also desired that equal distribution of property should prevail as far as possible. Plutarch's statement can hardly be correct, that Lycurgus undertook a new distribution of the land, by which 9000 lots fell to the Spartiatae and 30,000 to the Perioeci. Older writers do not mention it, and a redistribution of land is more suited to a conqueror. On the other hand, it is a fact that preservation of family property was promoted in every possible way. To sell landed possessions was regarded as a disgrace; if they belonged to the "ancient lot" it was prohibited. This lot denotes probably the original share allotted to a family. Practically there were rich and poor among the Spartiatae. This inequality of fortune arose spontaneously when there were several sons in a family, of whom only one inherited the lot. And it must have gone

on increasing since the law of Epitadeus, after the Peloponnesian war, permitted the donation and bequest of houses and land-lots.[15] Hence we assume that on the conquest of the first piece of Laconian territory each Spartiate received a land-lot, as was the case in every new settlement, that a new assignment of land was made after the conquest of Amyclae, and also after that of Messenia, but that in spite of this inequality of fortune prevailed, which there was no inclination to check by the introduction of a real communism.

At the head of the state there had existed from time immemorial the two kings. The Spartan monarchy was a continuation of that of the Homeric ages, only its authority was more strictly defined, and became gradually much limited. The kings of Sparta were the representatives of the nation with the gods. They had the same right to declare war as the Homeric kings, but like these they required the moral support of the nobles.[16] They were natural leaders in time of war, although subsequently other generals were often appointed. The jurisdiction of the kings became gradually very limited. The Spartans were not niggardly in external honours paid to their kings; Herodotus says that their royal funerals could be compared even with those of Asiatic despots. The Council (Gerousia) consisted of twenty-eight members. In this the two kings had seats. The method of election—by the shouts of the voters—is called childish by Aristotle. The Gerousia possessed criminal jurisdiction.[17] The people exercised their rights in the Apella (the assembly of the people) in accordance with the so-called Rhetra of Lycurgus, which concluded thus:—The people shall have the power of deciding questions, but with the modification introduced by Theopompus: if the people come to a wrong decision, the Gerontes and kings shall avert it. This is the theory of modern constitutionalism. In reality the Spartan Apella was similar to the people's assembly at Ithaca in the Odyssey.[18]

Among state-officials the Ephors occupied an exceptional

position. Even in antiquity there was no agreement as to the date of the origin and as to the original importance of this office. Were they introduced by Lycurgus or by Theopompus? Were they originally subordinate officials appointed by the king, as was asserted by Cleomenes III.? This latter supposition is very improbable.[19] The College of Ephors consisted of five members. They were elected (according to Aristotle in puerile fashion) by the people and from the people for one year. They summoned the Apella and the Gerousia and presided over both. They negotiated with foreign ambassadors, gave instructions to the generals, and interfered in the name of Sparta with the affairs of other cities. They had a general superintendence over the young. They punished at their own discretion all actions of the citizens which appeared to them unseemly, they controlled all other officials, and especially the kings. The kings had to appear before them at the third citation, and when they passed the Ephors were not obliged to rise like the rest of the people. The Ephors in Sparta had a similar position to that of the Ten and the State-Inquisitors at Venice, where the Doge may be compared to the Spartan kings. As in Venice, so in Sparta the power of the overseers of the state probably increased. But the Ephors, like the Ten, were presumably appointed state-overseers from the very first. Without them the Spartan constitution would not have lasted so long as it did.

But all the Spartan institutions had one object in view, that of fitting the citizen as far as possible for the service of the State. Discipline (Agoge) was applicable to all. The great aim was to secure physically capable citizens. The new-born child was shown to the elders of the Phyle, that they might decide whether it should be preserved or not. Up to his seventh year the boy remained at home under female supervision. Then the State undertook his training. The boys were divided into companies, each of which was supervised by a Paedonomus. Men were allowed to be present at the

exercises, which consisted of running, jumping, wrestling, throwing and dancing, but not boxing. Their food was just sufficient to support life; those who wanted more had to steal it, and if caught they were punished. In order to accustom the boys to bear pain, they were flogged from time to time at the altar of Artemis Orthia. The training of the intellect was limited in scope. Great importance, however, was attached to the learning of music, the character of which was under the control of the State. The boys were often taken to the Syssitia of the men, to hear what was good and useful and to accustom them to quick repartee. Much weight was attached to precise expression; the union of brevity with wit has never been so successfully practised as in Sparta. The Spartans, like the Romans, had many abstract deities, and worshipped among others the genius of laughter, Gelos.[20] All citizens of a certain age had the right of correcting the children and, if necessary, of punishing them. In consequence the younger ones maintained a very modest bearing. The girls were trained like the boys, but apart. At times they looked on at the exercises of the boys, and in like manner the boys watched theirs. The Spartan women were considered the strongest and the most beautiful in Hellas.

The youths passed out of the boys' companies at the age of eighteen. They were called Melleirenes until their twentieth year, and Eirenes up to their thirtieth, but not till then were they treated as men, and not till then did they generally marry. Every citizen in possession of a land-lot was obliged to marry. If the marriage was childless separation was usual. Marriage in Sparta was regarded more from the point of view of the farmer who looks after the breed of his animals. The result of the training was to place the woman more on an equality with the man than was the case in other Greek states. Thus women attained to great influence in Sparta, an influence which was sometimes stigmatized as petticoat government.

Concern for the State was especially prominent in the regulations made for the common meal, the so-called Pheiditia or Syssitia, which was a transfer of the life of the camp to times of peace.[21] It was one of the conditions under which a Spartan was admitted to the exercise of his civic rights that he took part in the Syssitia and paid his contribution to it. Companionship at table was arranged by their own choice. The chief dish was the famous black soup. The dress of the Spartans was simple; they adorned themselves only for battle. Their houses, the wood in which might only be worked with axe and saw, were devoid of ornament. For inland commerce only iron money was used, and this was quite sufficient; for the soil produced all that was necessary, and superfluity was forbidden. Hence there was little or nothing to be bought. Few foreigners came to Sparta, and such artists and philosophers as came were certainly guests of the State. For the Spartans were by no means hostile to art or science, but held that they should serve the interests of the State. Of native Spartan art there is very little mention with the exception of sculpture. The so-called Deikeliktae gave mimic representations of popular scenes; but this did not give rise to a drama in Sparta. The poverty of Sparta in works of art is proved by the records of the ancients and by ocular evidence.[22] Sparta was a great military camp, and the Spartans had, as a rule, no other occupation than that of serving as soldiers when they were required to do so. Agesilaus availed himself of this on one occasion, when he wished to make some discontented allies understand who were the real soldiers. Of the allies every man had a trade, while the Spartan contingent on the other hand was a troop composed of gentlemen. As a rule a war was carried on by a few Spartans with a numerous contingent of Perioeci and Helots. The valuable life of a Spartiate was spared as much as possible, but not from cowardice. For a battle the Spartans put on purple robes and wreaths as for a festival.

The Spartans formed one highly-centralized State. The country was mostly inhabited only by Perioeci and Helots. The full citizens remained in Sparta, spending their time in athletic exercises, in conversation, and in short hunting expeditions, the evening being devoted to the common meal, which never degenerated into a carouse. Sparta needed no walls; the centre of such a powerful organization was not easily approached by an enemy.

The Spartans are one of the few examples of what a State can perform, which has one aim, the preservation of existing institutions, and pursues it with wisdom and energy. It was a one-sided idea of life, yet it proved of great service to Greece. Sparta certainly possessed hardly anything of what makes Greece of importance for all time, that is, of art or of science. But, in the first place, it helped much to make Greece feared, and thus worked for her preservation. And secondly, but for Sparta the athletic exercises of the Greeks would probably never have existed. Sparta appears to have given the Olympian games that impulse which did so much for the welfare of Greece. And who would care to contest the assertion that without the Olympic games we should never have had Greek sculpture?

Finally, we must do her justice in another direction. It is true that Spartan education and Spartan government were a mere training-school, but what were the means which were employed? They appealed to the noble and generous side of human nature, to simplicity of life, self-control, respect for natural and social superiors, and obedience to the higher powers in the widest sense of the word; all this was the rule in Sparta, and it was strictly carried out in practice. It is not too much to say that some bright lights would be wanting in the moral picture of Greece if Sparta had not existed. And lastly, is it not a special glory of Greece, something of which no other country can boast, that it included two States, each so grand in its own particular way,

so different, and yet so distinctly national, as Athens and Sparta?

NOTES

1. We are now entering upon the really historical age, historical in the sense that of the events henceforth to be related there exist records approximately or quite contemporaneous. The art of writing was used for recording matters of public interest, at first only lists of kings, archons and priests, while events and especially the details of events were left for the present to oral tradition, which soon took shape in poetry and afterwards in prose. Hence we find that at an early date attention was given to chronology, but unfortunately there was no common era, and so the dates are more or less in the air. A good example is the chronology of the colonization of Sicily given by Thucydides. He dates the earliest settlements partly from the taking of Troy, partly from the arrival of the Greeks in the island; the founding of the Greek towns he dates from that of the first, Naxos, but does not say when it was founded, and so no date is quite certain. Attempts at chronological arrangement have been made since Aristotle's time, especially by the Alexandrians; but unfortunately for the most part with the imaginary date of the taking of Troy as a starting-point. Even the Olympiads are not generally used before the time of Timaeus. Hence few dates before the year 500 are certain, which is shown by the discrepancies in the modern dates of events of great importance, *e.g.* the Messenian wars, the wars between Athens and Megara, the fall of Croesus, the reign of Polycrates, and the details of that of Pisistratus. The positive dates given by Eusebius and others are the product of combination and arbitrary selection. And even the lists of the Olympiads, as Mahaffy has shown in his Problems Appendix, are not authentic from the beginning. And the facts themselves, if we look closely into them, are not more firmly established than the general outlines. This is shown by the discrepancies both in the ancient and modern narratives of the history of Sparta, Argos, and even of Athens. The recently-discovered work of Aristotle—the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία—illumines our darkness like a flash of lightning. Much of this is due to the wretched state of the records at our disposal. Aristotle knew far more than we do. Judging by his fragments, we have cause to regret especially the loss of Ephorus —the main authority for the version generally accepted in the present day—as well as of the Politics of Aristotle, the whole of Timaeus, books 6-10 of Diodorus; if only we had the whole of Nicolaus of Damascus! Of those still extant, the most important

are Plutarch's Lycurgus and Solon, the characteristic narrative of Herodotus (who unfortunately does not, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus thinks, record all the important events in Greece during the last 220 years before B.C. 480), portions of Thucydides, Pausanias, Strabo and other geographers, and Diog. Laertius. The rest is due to subsequent compilation. It would certainly be desirable for the proper construction of Greek history before 500 B.C. if we could discover the best tradition of the events of those times, then pick what remains of it out of the heap of rubbish, and give a separate account of everything that does not correspond to it. But what has failed in the case of Roman history is not likely to succeed with the history of Greece. We must avail ourselves of all the resources of historical criticism (see Preface), which have been applied of later years with so much acumen.— For the earlier history of Sparta, cf. among others G. Gilbert, Studien zur altspartanischen Geschichte, Gött. 1872, and his Handb. der griech. Staatsalterthümer, also Busolt, Die Lakedaimonier, Lpz. 1878, Vol. I. Lists of kings were kept at Sparta, but only from the eighth century ; the earlier lists were afterwards filled in arbitrarily.—The division of Laconia, Str. 8, 364 ; cf. also Nic. Dam. fr. 36 M. ; Con. narr. 36, 47. Minyae from Lemnos to Laconia, Polyaen. 7, 49 ; Plut. mul. virt. 8 ; Qu. Gr. 21. Founding of Thera, Herod. 4, 145 seq. Conquest of Amyclae by Teleclus, Paus. 3, 2, 6. Timomachus, Ar. Pol. Lac., Schol. Pind. Isthm. 7, 18.

2. For the double kingship in Sparta, Herod. 6, 51 seq. ; Duncker, 5, 252 ; Wachsmuth, Ursprung des Doppelk. in Sp., N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1868. In Polyaen. 1, 10, which is quoted by Wachsmuth and others in support of the theory of a racial difference in the two royal houses, I see no trace of Eurysthenidae, but on the contrary, only Heraclidae, *i.e.* conquering Dorians and Eurysthidae, the successors of Heracles' taskmaster. Schömann (I. 238) considers Eurysthenes and Procles as step-brothers, one the son of a Dorian woman, the other of a Cadmean woman of the family of the Aegidae ; the Aegidae had helped the Dorians, hence a share in the kingdom was given to the son of an Aegid woman. Gilbert adds a third Aegid kingship, and so does Stein (Lycurgus), who considers Lycurgus to be the last Minyan king and the last Aegid. But Minyae and Aegidae are not identical, and if we cannot explain the existence of two kings, the theory of a third does not make the task an easier one. The Theraean epitaph quoted by Gilbert, Staatsalt. I. 7, can hardly be regarded as a historical document. Th. Meyer (Abh. der Soc. phil. Gott. für E. Curtius, Gött. 1868) asserts that the Eurypontidae were Achaeans. The remark of Cleomenes to the priestess of Athene (Herod. 5, 72), "I am no

Dorian, but an Achaean," does not prove the proposition for which it has been quoted, that he and not his colleague was an Achaean. The remark was intended to strike the hearer ; this it could only do if it proclaimed a generally recognized fact, which was, that both royal houses were Achaean in their capacity of Heraclidae. This they claimed to be ; it was not believed in antiquity that one house was Dorian, and an allusion to it would have been of no service to Cleomenes.—Other traces of a dual monarchy in Greece have been pointed out by H. Gelzer in the above quoted Abh. der Soc. phil. Gott. 1868.

3. So Gelzer, Rh. Mus. 32, 259, and Gutschmid quoted in Busolt, Die Lakedaimonier, I. 37.

4. There is a detailed collection of records concerning Lycurgus and his constitution in Plutarch's biography, which rests chiefly on the authority of Ephorus, Aristotle, Hermippus, and the Spartan Aristocrates. For Lycurgus as an Agiad, see Herod. 1, 65, 66. Aristotle (Pol. 4, 9, 10), in representing him as sprung ἐκ τῶν μέσων, does not mean to deny his royal extraction. For the relations between Lycurgus and Crete, Str. 10, 482. We cannot quote all that has been written about Lycurgus in more modern times, but can only refer to the following works : K. Stein, Kritik der Ueberlieferung über Lykurg, Glatz. 1882 ; Progr. und das 7 Heft der Philologischen Untersuchungen, edited by Kiessling and von Wilamowitz - Möllendorff, Berl. 1884, pp. 267-285 ; Bazin, De Lyc., Par. 1885 ; E. Meyer, Die Lyk. Verfass., Rhein. Mus. vols. 41, 42 (also in his Forschungen z. alten Gesch. 1892) ; Busion, Lyk. und die grosse Rhetra, Innsbr. 1887 (he accepts a historical Lycurgus) ; Niese, Zur Verfassungsgesch. Lakedämons, Hist. Zeitschrift, 26, 1.

5. For the date of Lycurgus, Thuc. 1, 18. Herodotus places him earlier. Cf. Duncker, 5, 268, 269.

6. The existence of such a person as Lycurgus is denied by Gelzer, Rh. Mus. 28, 1 ; by Gilbert, Studien, 80, and Gr. Staatsalt. I. 15 ; and by von W.-Möllendorff. Gilbert considers him to be an Apollo Lycius, von W.-M. thinks he is a Zeus Lycaeus. Those who, like ourselves, hold that personal character has a more marked influence in Greece than in any other country, will not be easily convinced that Lycurgus is a fabulous personage. It is true that the predilection of the Greeks for personal heroes induced them to create them where they did not exist, still we must take each case on its own merits. There is no conclusive evidence against the existence of the legislator Lycurgus. Against the arguments of von Wilamowitz, we may remark (1) that in assuming an identity between "laws" and "written laws" (p. 275) he is making an unjustifiable

assumption; (2) when he assumes that Lycurgus could not be honoured as the founder of an aristocratic régime, because a caste is not apt to show gratitude, this cannot be a right view, because everything in the nature of hero-worship proceeds from those who have a community of feeling and of gratitude, and moreover the glorification of a chief would have the undeniable advantage for the caste of consolidating the institution introduced by him in favour of it; (3) when he says (p. 279) that tradition does not make Lycurgus a representative of the nobility but of the monarchy, he proves nothing, because tradition does not recognize any contrast between the legitimate monarchy and the legitimate community, which are both in possession of their rights and compatible with one another. That the part which I assign to Lycurgus is not incredible, is shown by a corresponding case in Venetian politics—Pietro Gradenigo and the dissolution of the Senate. The Doge Gradenigo acted a part which von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff will not allow Lycurgus to play. The parallel between Venice and Sparta might be pressed still further.

7. Herod. (1, 65, 66) speaks of the reforms of Lycurgus. A different version in Ar. Pol. 5, 9, 1. For the time of Theopompus Euseb. Schol. 2, 80, 81. The assertion of Herodotus (1, 65) that before Lycurgus the Spartans were the κακονομώτατοι of all the Greeks, only shows what he and others thought of them. The passage of Hellanicus quoted in Strabo 8, 366, to the effect that the Spartan constitution was given by Eurysthenes and Procles, shows that nothing definite was known about it.

8. Duncker (5, 263) adduces several arguments to prove that it cannot possibly have been derived from Lycurgus. Some of his statements rest on a slender foundation. He does not believe, for instance, that there was any reason for inculcating simplicity of life "in the wild mountainous district of the Sparta of that time," and so concludes that the Spartan sumptuary laws could not have been the work of Lycurgus. When, however, we consider that the pre-Dorian civilization of Greece was in a high state of development, that almost all barbaric conquerors have had a tendency to embrace the higher civilization of the conquered, and that the Dorians did so in Argolis, we can fully understand the appropriateness of the measures in question, as the work of a legislator of the ninth century who wished to provide against the evils which he feared. It is true that Laconia was far behind Mycenae in civilization, but we cannot accept a complete contrast between the two states. The inhabitants of Laconia were accustomed to many of the conveniences of life; this state of things was not to prevail with the Spartans. No people accepts the position of the Spartans without special

constraint. This constraint was imposed by the legislator whom the ancients called Lycurgus. The sumptuary laws of Lycurgus are therefore exactly suited to the occasion.

9. Duncker has done wonders in this ideal reconstruction of Spartan history. The period under discussion is dealt with in 5, 268 seq. In his opinion there existed originally two Dorian states in Laconia, that of the Agiadae on the middle Eurotas and that of the Eurypontidae higher up on the river Oenus. Thus the disunited Dorians of Laconia were inferior in strength to the Achaeans of Amyclae, and to the Tegeatae, by whom the Eurypontid Charilaus was slain (Paus. 8, 48, 3). Then Lycurgus came on the scene. Out of the two Dorian states of Laconia he consolidated one, with Sparta as its centre, whither the Eurypontidae also came. A joint Gerousia and popular assembly were introduced. The military discipline, the division of the land, the education of the young were all the result of later legislation. In like manner the share taken by Sparta in the organization of the Olympic Festival was of later origin. Sparta here simply took to herself the credit which was due to Messene. All these are highly ingenious hypotheses.

10. In the opinion of the ancients the Cretan constitution most resembled that of Sparta. In Crete, where we find no united state, but a number of republics (especially Cnossus, Gortyna, Cydonia, and Lyctus) there were, besides the Perioeci, two classes of serfs, the Clarotae or Aphamiotae, and the Mnoitae, who are compared with the Helots ; in contrast to them the Dorian lord prided himself on his prowess in arms (Schol. of Ath. 15, 695). The cities were governed by the Cosmi, or colleges of ten men ; a Gerousia and popular assembly had the same rights as at Sparta. The point of greatest similarity lay in the public life of the men ; we find here also Syssitia, called Andreia, which were subsidized by the state, but to which every one had to contribute the tenth part of his income. Cf. Schömann, I.[3] 312-329. In spite of all this, the Cretans obtained very early in antiquity as bad a reputation as the Spartans did a good one. See below.

11. For what follows cf. generally the accounts in the well-known works on political antiquities by Hermann, Schömann and Gilbert.

12. Εἵλωτες was usually derived by the ancients from the city of Ἕλος, but is now acknowledged to be from either the root ἑλ, in which case it would mean prisoners, or from their dwelling in ἕλη, boggy places.—For the population of Laconia cf. Büchsenschütz, Besitz und Erwerb, 138 seq.—Locus classicus for the Crypteia Plut. Lyc. 28, and Plat. Legg. 1, 633 ; for the man-hunts and their origin and the police-system, cf. Plat. Legg. 6, 763.—

Cleomenes III. and the Helots Plut. Cleom. 23.—Limitation of right of possessing property for Helots, Eph. quoted in Str. 365.—Helots in war time, Herod. 9, 28 ; Thuc. 4, 80 ; 7, 19.—Disappearance of the Helots, Thuc. 4, 80.—Neodamodes, Thuc. 4, 80 ; 7, 58 ; Xen. Hell. 6, 5, 28.—Mothaces Phylarch in Ath. 6, 271 ; Ael. V. H. 12, 43. Cf. Busolt, Die Laked. I. 24.

13. Unfavourable legal position of the Perioeci, Isocr. Panath. 178. A Perioecus as admiral, Thuc. 8, 22. The Cythereans, who were all Perioeci, are called Dorians in Thuc. 7, 57.

14. For the number of the Spartiates cf. Herod. 7, 234 ; Plut. Agis 5 ; ὁμοῖοι Ar. Pol. 5, 6, 1, and Gilb. I. 41 ; ὑπομείονες Xen. Hell. 3, 3, 6.

15. Redistribution of the land by Lycurgus Plut. Lyc. 8. This passage admirably refuted by Grote, who recognizes in it an ante-dating of the reforms of Agis and Cleomenes, and thus applies a much-used principle of modern historical criticism.—Principle of equality of Spartiate share in the πολιτικὴ χώρα, opinions of others quoted in Polybius 6, 45. Prohibition of sale of land Heracl. Pol. 2, 7. Law of Epitadeus Plut. Agis 5. Cf. Gilb. St. A. I. 13, and especially Duncker, Ueber die Hufen der Spart., Monatsb. der Berl. Ak. 1881, p. 138 seq.

16. The Spartan kings Herod. 6, 51-60 ; Xen. Hell. 5, 3, 20 ; Xen. Resp. Lac. ; Plut. Ages. 20.

17. Method of electing the council, Ar. Pol. 2, 6, 16. Aristotle would doubtless have pronounced the show of hands at English elections to be childish. He was a man of cut and dried systems.

18. Rhetra of Lycurgus and their modification, Plut. Lyc. 6.

19. The establishment of the Ephors is assigned to Lycurgus by Herod. 1, 65 and others, to Theopompus by Arist. Pol. 5, 9, 1. The assertion of Cleomenes is found in Plut. Cleom. 10, the only passage which assigns an increase of their power to one Asteropus. Acc. to Diog. L. 1, 3, 68 the sage Cheilon raised them to the rank of kings. Of modern writers cf. Schäfer, De Ephoris Laced. Gryph. 1863 ; Frick, De Eph. Spart. Gott. 1872 ; Dum, Entstehung und Entwickelung des spart. Ephorats, Innsbr. 1878 ; and Gilbert, St. A. I. 15, 58-63. In opposition to the opinion of Cleomenes, which is now shared by many, I make the following remarks. His assertion is not capable of proof (even Plut. Ap. Lac. Anaxil. does not prove it). He makes it in his own interest, as he wishes to overthrow the Ephors. It is intrinsically improbable that subordinate officials appointed by the kings should ever have obtained such authority in Sparta. On the contrary, the account in Ar. Pol. 5, 9, 1, states precisely that they were appointed to control the monarchy ; why should we believe an unproved and

improbable statement, which was evidently invented by the opponents of the Ephors, perhaps even before the time of Cleomenes? In Greece everything was proved by invented historical facts. Similar statement as to Demaratus, Herod. 7, 3. Ceremonies upon entering office, Ar. quoted in Plut. Cleom. 9. Cf. Helbig, Homer Epos, p. 172 seq.—The Scytale cf. Plut. Lys. 19. Observation of the heavens by the Ephors, Plut. Ag. 11.

20. Plut. Lyc. 25; Ath. 4, 173; 2, 39: Μάττων, Κεράων, Δαίτων.

21. Syssitia, members σύσκηνοι, consequently tent-companions in camp. The decision of the mess anent the admission of a newcomer corresponding to the admission through comrades into an officers' mess; Plut. Lyc. 12, μέλας ζωμός, *ibid.* Simplicity in domestic architecture the result of a rhetra of Lycurgus, Plut. Lyc. 13.

22. Description of Sparta, Thuc 1, 10.

With regard to the similarity of the Spartan institutions to those of other states, we make the following observations. We find Syssitia introduced among the Oenotrians by King Italus, Ar. Pol. 7, 9, 2. Hence the common life of the men is not peculiar to the Dorian races. But this common public life implies the possibility of the existence of a state like the Spartan. For the Syssitia counteracted the ascendency of family life, which otherwise gives the tone to the state, and paved the way for a minute control exercised by the magistrates. But what distinguished Sparta from other states provided with similar institutions was the real existence of this control throughout centuries. This was the fundamental difference between her and all the others. The similarity of the Spartan constitution to the Cretan must be criticized in this light. This similarity is merely external. What were the peculiarities of the Cretan republics which gave them a special resemblance to Sparta? It was not the existence of the class of serfs, for other states had that also. It was not education, for, as is not usually noticed, in this respect Crete bears no analogy to Sparta, as the supposed education of the Agelae in Crete did not begin until their seventeenth year, at an age when real education was completed. Hence the only point of comparison is the Syssitia. In other words, there prevailed in Crete, if the accounts of the ancients themselves concerning the island are not unjustifiable generalizations, an advanced communism, but of a more external character; in Sparta this communism was not so advanced externally (witness the direct personal contributions to the Syssitia), but it was used as the means of transmitting a great political idea which was firmly and consistently pursued for centuries. That is

why the Cretans accomplished nothing of importance and soon degenerated, while the Spartans did great things in history. That is why Cretan institutions are mere historical curiosities, and the Spartan an essential factor in history. Accordingly we need attach no importance to the old insoluble problem as to the priority of Cretan or Spartan institutions. The leading idea of the Spartan state did not at any rate come from Crete. The laws of Gortyna discovered by Halsherr and Fabricius show no trace of communism; for an instance to the contrary see the old Germanic Institut der Eideshelfer, of rare occurrence elsewhere, published by Bücheler and Zitelmann, 1885, and others.

CHAPTER XVI

SPARTA UP TO THE MIDDLE OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY. THE MESSENIAN WARS

THE constitution of Lycurgus almost of necessity forced the Spartans into attempting fresh conquests. When the number of fully qualified citizens became larger than that of the land-lots, it was necessary to procure new ones. If a common sentiment of union had existed among all the Dorians, the Spartans would have had to direct their conquests against the Arcadians, who were not their kinsmen. But this feeling of clanship did not exist at that time, in fact even in later times it expressed itself more in words than in deeds. The Spartans reduced their nearest Dorian neighbours, the Messenians, to submission, and treated them in the harshest fashion. The Messenian wars take up about a century, from about the middle of the eighth to the middle of the seventh century B.C.[1]

The chronology and incidents of these wars were not recorded at the time. The Spartans boasted of their victories, and the Messenians, especially those who succeeded in escaping to foreign lands, consoled themselves for their defeats by singing the praises of the heroes who had in vain endeavoured to avert the calamity. When at last, in the fourth century B.C., Messenia was restored to independence, the old stories were of course collected with still greater zeal, and found expression in prose and verse.

Messenia is an exceptionally fertile country. It consists chiefly of the plains, the waters of which empty themselves into the Messenian Gulf. They may be divided into an upper and a lower level. The upper, bordering on Arcadia, is called the plateau of Stenyclarus, after the town which was the first residence of the Dorian kings of the country. It is enclosed by projecting spurs of mountain chains, the westernmost of which was dedicated to the worship of Zeus, and was the site of the famous citadel of Ithome, round which the city of Messene grew up in later times. Through the lower plain, remarkable for its luxuriant vegetation, flows the river Pamisus, in the east, towards the Laconian boundary, the river Nedon. The Dorians occupied this territory under Cresphontes, who was on friendly terms with the Arcadians, and became the son-in-law of the king of Trapezus. According to Ephorus, Cresphontes divided the country into five parts; he resided himself in Stenyclarus, and placed subordinate kings in Pylus, Rhium, Mesola and Hyameia. Dorians and Achaeans were to have equal rights. This may be interpreted as an allusion to the fact, that the Dorians occupied only Stenyclarus at first, while they left the lower valley and the sea-coast to the original inhabitants. Cresphontes was killed in an insurrection, and his sons shared the same fate, with the exception of Aepytus, who continued the race. Aepytus was brought up by King Cypselus of Trapezus, and was afterwards re-established in his own country by the Spartan and Argive Heraclidae.[2]

The above narrative seems to exhaust the interest of its inventors for a time. Connected accounts do not occur again until the beginning of the war with Sparta. Up to this point there are nothing but meaningless names of kings: Glaucus, Isthmius, Dotadas, Sybotas, Phintas, of whom Pausanias only relates matters appertaining to religion—how Glaucus bade the Dorians worship the Ithomian Zeus, how Sybotas commanded Eurytus to offer sacrifice at Andania before the festival

of the great goddesses, and how Phintas sent a sacred embassy to Delos. The Messenians took an active part in the neighbouring Olympic games. We find seven Messenians among the first eleven winners dating from 776 B.C. The Messenians were evidently characterized by aspirations towards a higher civilization, and by a deep interest in all that concerns mankind, hence it is the more to be regretted that the development of the race received such a sudden check. The war with Sparta broke out under Antiochus the successor of Phintas.

Messenians and Spartans were accustomed to meet together for common sacrifice at a temple of Artemis Limnatis, which was situated in Messenian territory, on the western slopes of Taygetus and by the upper courses of the river Nedon. To get there the Spartans must have passed through the wild romantic gorge, which constitutes the direct route between Sparta and the Messenian sea-port of Calamata in the present day. The quarrel between the two races arose on this spot. As to its origin and who was to blame, the accounts of the Spartans and Messenians are contradictory. Only one fact is certain, that the Spartan king Teleclus was slain there. There was also a private quarrel between Polychares a Messenian and Euaephnus a Spartan. Envoys were sent to and fro, and accusations of murder and refusals of satisfaction were made on both sides. King Antiochus, who was opposed to all compromise, was succeeded by his son Euphaes. Thereupon the Spartans under Alcamenes attacked the citadel of Ampheia and took it. Incursions were made from both sides into the enemy's territory for four years. In the fifth and sixth years pitched battles were fought. Then fortune turned against the Messenians, who withdrew to the citadel of Ithome. The Delphian oracle advised them to sacrifice a virgin of the race of Aepytus. The brave Aristodemus offered his daughter; her betrothed resisted, and when, in order to save her, he asserted that she was no longer a virgin, Aristodemus killed her with his own hand. On the death of King Euphaes in the

thirteenth year of the war, the Messenians elected Aristodemus as his successor. In the eighteenth year of the war the Spartans renewed their exertions, and procured help from Corinth, but the Messenians were assisted by Arcadians, Argives and Sicyonians. A battle was fought, in which the Spartans were defeated. But in the end the Messenians got the worst of it. They had received an oracle from Delphi prophesying success to that side which should first put up a hundred tripods round the altar of Zeus in Ithome. A Spartan heard of this and secretly put up a hundred little clay tripods. Other unfavourable signs were also observed. The daughter of Aristodemus appeared to him in a dream and threw a shroud over him, whereupon he killed himself. After this the Messenians despaired of success and evacuated Ithome in the twentieth year of the war. The whole of Messenia was incorporated with Sparta. So far the legend.

It is certain that the Spartans made this important addition to their territory in the latter half of the eighth century B.C. And the course of the war appears on the whole to be correctly described in the legend. The Spartans must have conquered the border territory towards the north first—for they had already, as we shall see, entered into relations with the Eleans—and then the southern plain. Thus it was natural that Ithome, with its central situation, should be the last stronghold of the Messenians. The Spartans took the best land, the lower plain, for themselves. Their allies, Dryopians expelled from Argolis, received a portion of the western coast of Messenia, where they founded a new Asine. There were also Messenians who had joined the Spartans; they received the district of Hyameia. All the rest that were left behind were made Helots. But many went abroad; some did not venture beyond the limits of the Peloponnese; others joined those Messenians who had previously with the Chalcidians founded Rhegium in southern Italy.

The conquest of Messenia took place during the reigns of Polydorus, the son of Alcamenes, an Agiad, and Theopompus, the

son of Nicander, a Eurypontid, to whom were also ascribed the appointment of the Ephors and the modification of the Rhetra.

The issue of the war was not satisfactory to all the Spartans. The leaders were not impartial in their distribution of the booty. The Partheniae headed the discontented party. This name has given rise to various legends, of which the substratum of fact is that they were youths born during the Messenian war, who were to be excluded from full civic rights. They planned a revolt under the leadership of Phalanthus. The government was to be attacked at the festival of the Hyacinthia, and Phalanthus was to give the signal by putting on a cap. The plot was discovered, and a herald was ordered to proclaim that Phalanthus must not put on his cap. The conspirators thus became aware that the government could not be surprised and gave up their intention. It appears that they demanded a fifth part of the land conquered in Messenia. Their claim was not granted, and they emigrated and founded Tarentum. The circumstance that the revolt was fixed for the Hyacinthia, which was an Amyclaean and Achaean festival, and the fact that the Tarentines also celebrated that festival point to the supposition that Achaeans were chiefly concerned in the movement.[3]

For over half a century Messenia remained in possession of the Lacedaemonians. Then the conquered nation revolted. They found allies in the Pisatae, the Argives and Arcadians. The Spartans had long been desirous of extending their sovereignty over Arcadia, hence hatred of Sparta must have existed in that country; the Pisatae were at feud with the Eleans, who were the *protégés* of the Spartans, while the Argives had always been rivals of Sparta for the supremacy of the Peloponnese.

The rising began on the northern boundary, at Andania. A descendant of the old royal family of the Aepytidae, Aristomenes, placed himself at the head of the Messenians.[4] It was natural that the revolt should break out in the north, for in this

direction Arcadia served as a support. But in the south also he found partisans in the Messenians of Hyameia and the Achaeans of Pylus and Mothone. Aristocrates, king of Orchomenus, came from Arcadia, and Pantaleon from Pisa. A great battle was fought in the plain of Stenyclarus, in which the Messenians proved victorious. For the present Messenia was lost to Sparta, and this was a source of discord among the Spartans. For many of them possessed landed property in Messenia only, and objected to the defeat inflicting greater injury on them than on their fellow-citizens. They demanded compensation in Laconian territory, and a redistribution of the land. That the enemies of Sparta gained the advantage is seen by the fact that the chief of the Pisatae presided over the Olympic festival in the year 644 B.C. instead of the Eleans. It was a reaction in favour of the old inhabitants against the Dorians in the south of the Peloponnese.

But on this occasion also the Spartans were saved, through the instrumentality of Tyrtaeus. The Delphic oracle had bidden them fetch a deliverer from Athens in time of need, and so they sent for Tyrtaeus, who was a native of Aphidnae, an Attic district. Even in antiquity many supposed that Tyrtaeus was not a foreigner; but as King Pausanias himself admitted it, we need not doubt that the Spartans did accept aid from a foreigner. The invitation, moreover, is more intelligible if we take the following fact into consideration. The Dioscuri were regarded as the divine protectors of the Spartans. They, as well as their sister Helena, were specially worshipped at Aphidnae. Hence if a poet, who had already attained celebrity, lived in that district, it was natural that the Spartans should send for him in their time of trial, for he of course might know how to move the Dioscuri to save Sparta. It is true that we have no record of any hymns addressed by Tyrtaeus to the Dioscuri; his poems went more straight to the point, and aimed at raising the sinking courage of the Spartans. With this object he reminded them

in elegiac metre of their glorious past, and depicted the prosperity and honour which are the reward of valour, and the disgrace which attaches to cowardice. The tone of Tyrtaeus' poems, which include several marching songs, is simple and expressive.

His endeavours were successful. A great battle was fought in which the Messenians were defeated, in consequence as is alleged of the treachery of Aristocrates, for which he was slain by the Arcadians. The Messenian cause was lost. But in spite of the defeat they maintained themselves for eleven years longer in their last place of refuge. This was a mountain height named Eira, and like the peak of Ithome, situated at the source of the Neda, which empties itself into the Ionian Sea not far from Phigaleia. To this day a double ring of roughly-built fortifications, surrounded by terraces, can be seen on the summit. Here Aristomenes conducted the defence with great tenacity. He was taken prisoner by the Spartans and thrown into the *caiadas* to die, but an eagle carried him on its back uninjured to the foot of the precipice, whence he followed a fox through a narrow passage into the open country. Eira fell by accident into the hands of the enemy, but the Spartans allowed the conquered to depart unharmed with Aristomenes. They joined their allies, the Achaeans of Pylus and Mothone, and migrated to Rhegium. Aristomenes himself went to Rhodes and became, through the marriage of his daughter with the king of Ialysus, the ancestor of the famous Diagoras, who was often victorious at the Olympic and other great games, and has been celebrated by Pindar.

Thus the Spartans became masters of the whole of the southern Peloponnese, for they wrested the territory between the eastern slope of Mount Parnon and the sea from Argos. At the close of the seventh century B.C. they were the chief power in the Peloponnese. Their heavy hand was felt especially in Arcadia and the states of Elis. In Greece they

represent the principles of conquest abroad and strict conservatism at home.[5] Thus they remain the warlike nucleus of the Greek race, leaving to other branches the task of developing the manifold germs of greatness present in the Greek mind.

NOTES

1. Of the Messenian wars we have detailed accounts in Pausanias 4, 4-13 for the first, 14-24 for the second ; cf. also Str. 6, 257 ; Diod. 15, 66 ; Just. 3, 5. The authority for the first war was Myron of Priene, who was hostile to the Spartans and wrote in prose ; cf. Müller, Fr. H. Gr. 4, 460 ; for the second, the Epos of Rhianos from Bena in Crete. It is evident that the contradictory accounts of the ancients cannot give us the truth concerning these wars. For modern criticism of the authorities, cf. R. Dundaczek, Beiträge zur Geschichte der beiden ersten mess. Kr., Progr. Czernow, 1882 ; and Busolt, Zu den Quellen der Messeniaka des Pausanias (Jahrbuch f. class. Phil. 127, p. 814 seq.) The chronology, following Pausanias, of the first war, 743-724, of the second, 685-668. Other accounts of the ancients show discrepancies. Cf. the careful balancing of the questions involved by Duncker, 5, 421, who places the first war between 735 and 716, the second 645-631. We would only remark, apropos of Duncker's dissertation, that it is not certain, as he assumes, that the war with Argos, which, acc. to Pausanias, 3, 7, 5, King Theopompus lived to see, is the same as that which is mentioned in Paus. 2, 24, 8, and which he places in 669. His proofs, therefore, are not incontrovertible. But the fact that, acc. to Paus. 6, 22, 2, the Pisatae had the conduct of the Olympic games in the 34th Olympiad, makes it probable that there was at that time war between Messenia and Sparta. The Pantaleon of Pisa referred to by Pausanias is mentioned by Str. 8, 362, as appearing in the second Messenian war.

2. For ancient Messenian history, Ephorus quoted in Str. 8, 361 ; Apollod. 2, 8, 4 ; Plat. Leg. 683, 684 ; Nic. Dam. fr. 39 ; Paus. 4, 3, 8 ; 8, 5, 6.

3. For the Partheniae, etc., Str. 278, 279 ; Diod. 15, 66 ; Ar. Pol. 5, 6, 1 ; Theop. fr. 190 ; Polyb. 12, 5. Acc. to Theopompus the conspirators were Epeunacti, *i.e.* Helots, whom the Spartan women had taken as husbands during the absence of the Spartans in the Messenian war. We must, however, in view

of the agreement of the majority of writers, keep to the name Partheniae, and if we follow Aristotle we must assume that they were sons of Spartiates (ὁμοίων). In that case the mothers were perhaps of humble rank, and those writers would be correct who discern in the history of the Partheniae the fact that the right of inheritance among the Spartans was greatly limited in the period between the first and second Messenian wars. Formerly, sons of Spartans and of women of inferior rank had been capable of inheriting property, henceforward this was not to be the case. Duncker takes this view, 5, 432. We cannot urge against this the fact that the Mothaces were afterwards recognized as Spartiates, for the laws on this subject may have changed in Sparta in the course of time. Polemarchus, who slew Polydorus, had a μνῆμα in Sparta, Paus. 3, 3, 3. From this Duncker, 5, 433, concludes that there was a compromise between the two parties. Yet the traitor Pausanias had also statues in Sparta, Paus. 3, 17, 7. A fifth part of Messene was eventually conceded to them, Eph. quoted by Strabo 6, 280.

4. Second Messenian war, state of affairs at Sparta, Ar. Pol. 5, 6, 2 ; Paus. 4, 16, 6 ; 4, 18, 3. Tyrtaeus as ἡγεμών, Str. 8, 362 ; Philostr. ap. Ath. 14, 630 (στρατηγία). Exaggeration of the expression ἡγεμών, Lyc. c. Leocr. 105. Tyrtaeus fetched by order of Delphi, Paus. 4, 15, 6. King Pausanias on Tyrtaeus, Plut. Apophth. Lac.

5. This is easily reconcilable with the fact that they valued lyric poetry and introduced the Aeolian lyrics among themselves (v. W.-M., Homer-Unters. pp. 268, 269), and with the fact that they appreciated and used sculpture as the chief representative of the fine arts in that age. As far as we know Sparta made no progress of her own in literature or art ; they took pride, however, in using art in honour of the gods in a manner appropriate to the characteristics of their state. A certain influence on the development of the Spartan worship is ascribed also to the Cretan Thaletas, who is said to have introduced the Cretan war-dance into Sparta. But this personage is quite as mythical as the Cretan Epimenides.

CHAPTER XVII

OTHER PELOPONNESIAN STATES, ESPECIALLY ARGOS. PHEIDON. SPARTA'S RELATIONS WITH ARGOS, ARCADIA AND ELIS

At first Argos and not Sparta was the most important of the Dorian States, as is shown by the tracing of the descent of the Dorian kings from the Heraclidae. This could arise only in Argolis, the rulers of which prided themselves on being descended from the eldest son of Aristomachus. Their capital, however, was not Mycenae, but Argos, which lies nearer the coast, at the eastern base of the citadel of Larissa, which has an elevation of 900 feet above the level of the sea. Our knowledge of the political organization of the Dorian Argolis is very imperfect.[1] But on the whole it is certain that it was not, like Sparta, one centralized state, but a federation of states, at the head of which Argos held a decided supremacy. The greater part of the territory moreover belonged directly to Argos, especially the plain of the Inachus. It had its Perioeci, called Orneatae, and its Helots, the Gymnetes. We do not exactly know the position held by the famous cities of Mycenae and Tiryns. It appears that they had an Achaean population and enjoyed a certain amount of independence, which varied at different periods, as Argos became more or less powerful. On the eastern mountainous peninsula of Acte were two towns which had become almost entirely Dorian, Epidaurus and Troizene, but they were more allies than subjects of Argos. Epidaurus

was opposite Aegina, upon the east coast of Acte, on a tongue-shaped, rocky peninsula. About two leagues from the city, in the interior, the buildings of the famous shrine of Asclepius, where remarkable inscriptions have lately been found, covered a great extent of ground. Troizene was on the same coast farther to the south, opposite the island of Calauria. Two other cities, Asine and Hermione, had Dryopian inhabitants. The position of Asine cannot now be definitely ascertained, but it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of Nauplia, while Hermione lay in the centre of the bay which is formed by the broad end of the Argolic Acte opposite the island of Hydrea, on a tongue of land between two bights. These cities had at first submitted to the Dorians. Then Asine endeavoured to gain more independence by taking advantage of a war between Sparta and Argos. When Nicander, who is said to have reigned about 800 B.C., invaded Argolis, the Asineans made common cause with him. But the penalty was soon paid. Argos occupied Asine, and the inhabitants fled to Laconia. Hermione, on the other hand, maintained her independence so well that after the defeat of the Argives in the grove of Argos she was permitted to enter the Lacedaemonian federation of states. Nauplia, however, shared the fate of Asine; her inhabitants were expelled by the Argives, and received Mothone in Messenia for a home as a gift from the Spartans. Farther southwards the Aegean littoral, formed by the eastern slopes of Mount Parnon, had probably belonged to Argos since the Dorian invasion. But the influence of Argos spread also to the north-west and over a part of the Saronic Gulf. Sicyon, Phlius, Cleonae, and Aegina belonged with Argos to a sacrificial league, which had as its centre the temple of the Pythian Apollo beneath the Argive Larissa, and guaranteed peace at all events among its members.

Thus Argos, after the Dorian invasion, ruled directly or indirectly over what was formerly the most famous and most

important part of the peninsula, and possessed all the authority which had once belonged to Mycenae. In addition to this, the Argives had continued certain traditions connected with the district. Argolis had stood in close relationship to the East; from it Dorians had migrated eastwards; and in Crete and Rhodes, in Cos, Cnidus and Halicarnassus Argolis was regarded as the parent country by the last arrivals of colonists settled at those points of Asia. Thus various circumstances combined to make it possible for Argos to play an important political part, and only an able man was needed to utilize them and so increase the prestige of the city. Such a man was found in Pheidon.

The order of succession of the first kings of Argos is said to have been as follows: Temenus, Ceisus, Medon, Thestius, Merops, Aristodamidas, and Pheidon; the latter became king probably about 770 B.C.[2] According to Ephorus, when Pheidon took up the government, the inheritance of Temenus was no longer under one sceptre. Pheidon united the fragments again. He turned his arms against the districts of the Peloponnese which had formerly felt the strength of Heracles, and took into his own hands the control of the Olympic games, which had been founded by his ancestors. He made a plot against Corinth, sending for a thousand youths from that city, on the pretext that they were to serve in his military expeditions. He intended to kill them and make himself master of Corinth. But his confidant Abron betrayed the plot, and the intended victims effected their escape. Finally Pheidon became famous, according to Herodotus, by establishing a standard of weights and measures for the Peloponnese. He is said to have been the first to stamp coins in Greece. Long afterwards in the Heraeum near Argos could be seen bars of silver, obeliskoi, which Pheidon had dedicated to commemorate his having done away with this kind of money and having replaced it by stamped coins. His mint was in Aegina.

It is beyond question that Pheidon occupied a very im-

portant position in Greece. He evidently attempted to do for the north of the Peloponnese what Sparta afterwards succeeded in doing for the south. He not only re-united the inheritance of Temenus but also extended the sway of Argos over Sicyon ; that he was master of Aegina is proved by the statement that he stamped his coins in that island ; that he forced Corinth to fight as his auxiliary is shown by the story of the thousand youths. His appearance as president of the Olympic games was in the eighth Olympiad. He allied himself with the Pisatae against the Eleans, and thus came into collision with the Spartans. Ephorus says that the latter had turned their arms against him because he had wrested from them the hegemony of the Peloponnese. Pheidon is said to have been defeated by the united forces of the Spartans and Eleans, and Elis is said to have regained Pisatis and Triphylia with Sparta's help. Although there can be no question of the hegemony of Sparta in the Peloponnese as early as the first half of the eighth century, yet we may admit that she possessed considerable power at that period, and so the account of Ephorus is in the main not absolutely incorrect.

Pheidon, however, has gained a specially brilliant reputation by his supposed introduction of a standard of weights and measures and of coinage into Greece, or, according to Herodotus, into the Peloponnese. We shall now refer to his coins. In the civilized countries of Asia and Africa the precious metals had long served as a means of exchange, but they were taken according to weight, and the weight had in every case to be verified by the scales. Then the coin came into existence by the weight of a piece of metal being guaranteed by an official stamp, and thus the coin can be used for payment without further verification. The idea of using the stamp for this purpose originated, according to the ancients, not in the large civilized countries of central Asia, nor in Egypt, but in Asia Minor, or, according to the opinions of some writers, with Pheidon in Greece. We must come to the

conclusion that the discovery was only made at one place; in which case, as Asia Minor took the lead generally in civilization, Greece would have borrowed it from that country. In Asia Minor Lydia was said to have been the first country that used coins. They were bits of the pale impure gold, known as electrum, of which many have been preserved to the present day. The Pheidonian coins, on the other hand, were made of silver. Thus the originality of Pheidon may have consisted in his having introduced silver coins. This he is said to have done in Aegina, which means that the Aeginetan standard of coinage and the manufacture of the Aeginetan coins are ascribed to him. The Aeginetan standard was originally the most widely used in Greece. The coins bore a tortoise as a distinguishing mark. Whether any of these coins which have come down to us may be assigned to the age of Pheidon must be left undecided. As the coins at first had no inscription, but only images, it is impossible to distinguish which are the oldest among the early ones, or to fix their approximate date. But whatever may have been Pheidon's share in the introduction of coinage, he took an active part in the regulation of weights and measures in Greece, and did much to make the Greeks a commercial people of the first rank.[3]

Thus we find at this early stage among the Dorian conquerors of the Peloponnese two entirely distinct intellectual movements. They arrived in their new home a simple, vigorous, uncivilized people, much fewer in number than the conquered inhabitants. When they had settled down in the new territory, they were confronted with the necessity of choosing between two courses of action. The civilization of the conquered race was a far superior one. What was to be their attitude towards it? The Spartans would have nothing to do with it, while the Argives and their allies adopted it. We may say that the conquerors partly adapted themselves to the civilization of the places in which they

settled. Laconia had up to then not been remarkable for culture, and its influence could not have been very great in this respect. Argolis, on the other hand, had been the chief seat of Greek civilization in the time of the Dorians. The Dorian Argives continued the *rôle* played by the Achaean Argives, perhaps before Pheidon's reign, in any case under his rule and through his agency. He aimed at the hegemony of the Peloponnese, and for this purpose made use of the Olympic games. He maintained widespread relations with the East, in which the Argive colonies in Asia Minor were able to assist him; this explains his regulation of the standard of weights and measures. He was the lawful king of Argos, but his aspirations were not confined to being king in the sense in which the pre-Doric rulers had been kings. He wished to be king after the manner of the rulers of Asia, with which he was so closely connected. Hence he is often spoken of as a tyrant in antiquity. Lycurgus and Pheidon are the representatives of the two opposite aims of the Dorians of the Peloponnese.

It is impossible to say what took place in Argos after Pheidon's death.[4] But the monarchy still continued to exist. We possess the names of several Argive kings, who must have lived after him, but owing to the state of the chronology of these centuries, no agreement as to their order of succession is possible. It is certain that the start which Argos made under Pheidon did not last. On the contrary, it had great difficulty in maintaining its position both against Sparta and other Dorian States. The rise of the power of Sicyon and Corinth under their tyrants weakened the influence of Argos in the north, and Aegina was growing more and more independent. The Argives seem to have left these states alone, but they were always in a state of war with Sparta, defeating them in the seventh century in the battle of Hysiae, but being less successful subsequently.[5] The following incident related by Herodotus is peculiar.

In the middle of the sixth century the district of Thyrea was in the hands of the Spartans. The Argives wished to retake it, and marched into the country; the Spartans advanced to meet them. It was agreed to select 300 men from each side to fight against each other, and the decision of the question at issue was to abide the result. The combat took place, with the result that only three men were left alive, one Spartan, Othryadas, and two Argives, Alcenor and Chromius. But the Spartan must have pretended to be dead; at all events the Argives hastened homewards to announce the victory. In the meanwhile Othryadas despoiled the Argive bodies of their arms and brought them into the Spartan camp. When the Argives and Spartans returned both sides claimed the victory, and a general engagement ensued, in which the Spartans had the advantage. Sparta retained Thyrea, but Argos refused to waive her rights, or to acknowledge the Spartan victory, and in order never to forget what they had still to conquer it was decided that the Argive men should wear their hair short and the women put off their gold ornaments until Thyrea was recovered.

After Sparta and Argos the other Peloponnesian districts were at first of minor importance. Corinth owed her position to her commerce. The achievements of certain states under tyrants will be dealt with later on. The geographical centre of the peninsula is Arcadia, a country traversed by mountain ranges, separated by mountains from the surrounding cantons, and accessible by only a few passes in the north and east; it communicates with its southern neighbours solely by means of steep mountain-paths, and is convenient of access only on the side of the Ionian Sea through the valley of the Alpheius.[6] Arcadia had not been conquered at the time of the Dorian invasion of the Peloponnese. Mountain districts had little attraction for invaders who were in possession of fertile valleys and bays open to the sea. Moreover the Arcadians

had the usual virtues of mountaineers, courage and warlike capacity, so that the Dorians preferred to leave them in peace. The Arcadians did not form a centralized state; each canton was independent; many of them contained only villages without any town for a centre; few of them had cities. It is curious that their cities lay chiefly in the neighbourhood of the higher mountains; their names were, starting from the north and going south-east, Psophis, Cleitor, Pheneus, Stymphalus, Orchomenus, Mantinea and Tegea. The plains of central and south-western Arcadia had no important cities, until Megalopolis was founded there at a later period. But to the south-west, south of the Alpheius, there were some places of importance only in the legends, such as Lycosura, which was considered to be the oldest city of Arcadia, and Trapezus, which we have met with in the history of Messenia. There must have been factors at work in the history of Arcadia with which we are not sufficiently acquainted. Generally speaking the cities of this country were held to be of recent origin. Thus Mantinea is said to have been an agglomeration of five Demes made by the Argives, probably as a counterpoise to the power of Sparta. Tegea was also formed by a grouping of country districts, in a mythological period, by one Aleus, the son of Apheidas. The symbol of the union was the temple of Athene Alea.[7] The Arcadians were throughout distinguished by simple patriarchal customs, by a taste for music and a love of warfare, which, like the Swiss, they gladly practised in the service of foreigners. It is evident from history that in Arcadia, as in Switzerland, a feeling of the union of the whole early pervaded each individual canton, but to what political forms this feeling may have given birth in early times we cannot say. Mention is made of Arcadian kings, but it is not clear that they governed the whole of Arcadia. A real federal constitution does not seem to have existed until after the battle of Leuctra.

The state of Arcadia was calculated to make a country like Sparta desirous of controlling its resources. Besides, its south-western district contained the easiest route from the upper Eurotas valley to Olympia. Hence we find Sparta beginning her encroachments on Arcadia at an early stage. Charilaus, the kinsman of Lycurgus, is reported to have occupied the territory of Aegys, between the sources of the Eurotas and the Alpheius, and to have made an attack on Tegea, which lies between Laconia and Argos. The doubts to which accounts of this kind give rise have already been referred to. In the 30th Olympiad the Spartans, who as rulers of Messenia could now put out feelers farther west, attempted to plant themselves in the extreme south-westerly corner of Arcadia. They took Phigaleia, but were repulsed by the Arcadian tribe of the Oresthasians.[8] In the second Messenian war some Arcadians under King Aristocrates of Orchomenus assisted the Messenians. Just as the upper Eurotas leads to the Alpheius valley, so the upper courses of its tributary, the Oenus, lead to the plain of Tegea. In this district the Spartans took from the Arcadians all the territory which lies on the southern slope of the mountains, and thus geographically belongs to the valley of the Eurotas, in the east Caryae, and in the west the Sciritis. Having got so far they were in a position to advance a step farther in this direction. Under the kings Leon and Hegesicles, about 600 B.C., they asked the Delphic oracle whether they could not obtain the whole of Arcadia. This was refused by the god, but they were offered the prospect of subduing Tegea, at least this was the interpretation they put on the words of the Pythia. They were so confident of success, that they even carried chains with them to put on the Tegeatae. But the issue was different. They were defeated, and compelled to work on Tegean soil bound in their own chains. But in the next generation, under the kings Anaxandridas and Ariston, fortune changed. They received in answer to a fresh consultation of the oracle the command

to remove the bones of Orestes to Sparta, and the further information that they were to be found in Tegea, at a spot where two strong currents of air blew and stroke and counter-stroke resounded. Now it happened that during a truce with Tegea a distinguished Spartan named Lichas came there and heard from a smith that he had discovered in his field a coffin containing a body seven ells long. Lichas saw that a smithy answered the description of the oracle, gained possession of the field, and removed the body to Sparta. After that the supremacy of the Spartans over the Tegeatae was assured. They did not, however, subjugate Tegea, but only forced it into an alliance, and the Tegeatae became firm allies of the Spartans, and were proud of being allowed to take the post of honour on the left wing in battle. The example of the Tegeatae was followed by the other Arcadians, who allied themselves with Sparta.[9]

We must now discuss Sparta's relations to the plain of the lower Alpheius. Here, in the territory of the tribe of the Pisatae, who probably never possessed a real city, was the place where the festival of Olympia was held, of which we shall speak at length later on. At what date the festival was instituted is not known, but we are told that Lycurgus agreed with Iphitus of Elis that it should be placed under the protection of a special truce, and that the territory of Elis should be inviolable. The provision relating to the inviolability of the Elean territory is improbable, on the other hand it is probable that in the ninth century the Pisatae came under the rule of the Eleans. The intervention of Lycurgus, *i.e.* of the Spartans, is very doubtful, although it was founded upon the existence of a document of high antiquity, a discus with an inscription preserved in the Heraeum at Olympia, for we do not know whether the discus and the inscription were as old as was supposed. Still there is no denying that in the eighth century the Spartans held friendly intercourse with the Eleans and recognized them as stewards of the Olympic games.

The Pisatae, however, looked out for a favourable occasion for asserting their natural rights, and found one, as we have seen, in the time of Pheidon. But their triumph was of short duration. The Eleans had recovered the presidency as early as the 9th Olympiad. In the 34th Olympiad (644 B.C.) the Pisatae again seized an opportunity of regaining their old position. Under Pantaleon they assisted the Messenians, and Pantaleon presided over the Olympic games. The defeat of the Messenians entailed that of the Pisatae. In the 48th Olympiad a fresh attempt was made under Demophon, the son of Pantaleon. But the Eleans marched into the country and suppressed the rising. It was however repeated by Demophon's brother, Pyrrhus. We hear chiefly of the intervention of Dyspontium in the Pisatan district, and of that of Scillus and Macistus in Triphylia, which lay farther south. But on this occasion also the Pisatae were defeated. The inhabitants of Dyspontium for the most part fled to Epidamnus and Apollonia. Macistus and Scillus likewise lost their country to the Eleans. Only Lepreum maintained a certain independence.[10]

Of the Peloponnesian states the most northerly ones alone remain to be discussed. But of these Achaia as a country is of no importance to Greek history in general. It seemed as if this race, which was scattered along the narrow strip of land between the sea and the mountains, had been directed by nature not to take heed of the people on the other side of the mountain range, but to watch for favourable winds and sail to other shores, which offered a wider scope for their activity. According to Polybius, the Achaeans were at first ruled by kings, of whom Tisamenus was the first and Gyges the last.[11] After this—when is not known—each single town formed a state for itself, and matters of common interest were discussed at the temple of Zeus Amarius in Aegium. There were twelve towns; on the coast, going from west to east, Olenus, Patrae, Aegium, Helice, Aegae and Aegira; near the

coast, Dyme, Rhypes, Bura and Pellene; at some distance from it, Pharae and Tritaea. The Achaeans did great things for Greece, not in their Peloponnesian home, but in the colonies which they founded in Lower Italy.

Lastly, to the east of Achaia there is a group of states, of which three stand out prominently, Sicyon, Corinth and Megara, of which we shall speak when their period of glory arrives in the age of the Tyrants. But before this, we must devote our attention to a portion of non-Dorian Greece, and to the institutions which secured the union of all the Greek races.

NOTES

1. For the political relations of the states of the Peloponnese up to the time of the Persian Wars, cf. G. Busolt, Die Lakedaimonier und ihre Bundesgenossen, Lpz. 1878; of Argolis he speaks pp. 66-110, where the policies of the separate states, like Asine, Troizene, etc., are fully treated. For geographical details, cf. Bursian, Geogr. v. Gr., Bd. 2.—For Argos, cf. Fischer, Hist. Argivae Fragm., Bresl. 1850; Schneiderwirth, Politische Geschichte des dorischen Argos, I. and II., Heiligenstadt, 1865, 1866.

2. Lists of Argive kings according to Theopompus in Sync. (fr. 30 M.); according to Eph. quoted in Strab. 8, 548 (fr. 15 M.). Pheidon is on the contrary δέκατος ἀπὸ Τημένου. Paus. 6, 22, 2 gives as the date of Pheidon the 8th Olympiad; on account of the passage in Herodotus (6, 127), according to which he must have lived shortly before 600, and because Julius Africanus mentions the 28th Olympiad as being celebrated by the Pisatae, some scholars (notably Weissenborn) have wished to alter the 8 of Pausanias into 28. But in the first place, the story of the suitors of Agariste has no value as data for chronological research, and secondly, the 28th Olympiad would still be too early for the father of one of these suitors. According to Trieber in his Aufsätze dem Andenken an Waitz gewidmet, Hannover, 1886, Pheidon lived about Ol. 45-48.—Loci classici for Pheidon's work are Eph. fr. 15 (where also the λῆξις Τημένου is mentioned), and Herod. 6, 127. Pheidon's coins were minted in Aegina according to Eph., quoted in Str. 8, 376; cf. Etym. M. ὀβελίσκος; Eph. fr. 15 makes him the inventor of the μέτρα τὰ Φειδώνεια καλούμενα, καὶ σταθμούς, καὶ νόμισμα κεχαραγμένον, τό τε ἄλλο καὶ τὸ

ἀργυροῦν. Pheidon as tyrant, Herod. 6, 127 ; Ar. Pol. 5, 8, 4 ; Abron. Plat. Am. narr. 2. For Pheidon's date, cf. Unger in the Philologus, 1869.

3. Much research and many volumes have been devoted in modern times to the origin of coinage ; cf. esp. Fr. Lenormant, La monnaie dans l'antiquité, I. p. 125 seq. ; Barclay Head in his introduction to The Coins of the Ancients ; Percy Gardner, The Types of Greek Coins, Histor. Introd. In the opinion of the ancients the question lay between Pheidon and the Lydians, as is clearly stated by Poll. 9, 83. Ephorus decided in favour of Pheidon (Str. 8, 376), and many have followed him ; Herodotus is in favour of the Lydians (1, 94). Some ancient Lydian coins have come down to us, made out of pale Pactolus gold or electrum, also some old Aeginetan coins, with the tortoise. It is true that the oldest of them bear no distinctive mark which would enable us to fix their date even within half-a-century, but the soundest authorities are now agreed that this cannot be placed before 700 B.C. In that case Pheidon, who belongs to the eighth century, would no longer have any claim to the introduction of coinage, and we should have to replace the name of the king by that of the city which produced them. He may have introduced Oriental weights and measures, and hence the introduction of coinage, which followed close upon them, was ascribed to him in a manner easily comprehensible. Then there remains the question of the priority of Lydia or Greece, and on this point all competent judges now agree that it must be decided in favour of Lydia. Head asserts that the Lydians first made lumps of metal into money by stamping them, and that the Greeks of Asia Minor were the first to put regular images on the stamp, and that in any event they were the first to engrave names upon it. But it is not quite so certain, as is generally supposed, that the Lydians were really the inventors of coins. If a piece of precious metal guaranteed by a mark to be of full weight is to be regarded as a coin, and the lump shape is not essential, then coins existed in Cyprus at the beginning of the seventh century ; gold rings found at Curium with the name of King Eteander (first half of the seventh century) have evidently been used as coins ; they weigh 449 grains, or one mina (Perrot et Chipiez, III. 289). We know that rings were used as a currency by weight in Egypt. The weight in question is ascertained to have been in use in that country by the gold and silver plates which have been found in Sargon's palace in Assyria : a gold one weighs 167 grains, and a silver one 437 grains ; the former, taking the ratio of silver to gold as 1 : 13, would correspond to 5 minae. This mina then became known in Greece under the name of the Euboic standard. When we bear in mind that

the gold rings of Eteander are dated while the Lydian coins are not, there is nothing to prevent us assuming that stamped gold rings were in use before the time of Eteander, and we can at all events maintain that if the ring shape is compatible with the idea of a coin, the Lydians can hardly have invented coinage; if, on the contrary, the lump shape is essential, the honour probably rests with the Lydians. We conclude our note with a few remarks on the standards of coinage used in Greece, taken partly from Percy Gardner, and partly from the writings of Imhoof and Six. Originally the Aeginetan standard was the most widely known in Greece; it probably came from Phoenicia. The Euboic standard, which had its origin in Babylonia, appears at first to have been adopted only by Samos, but in course of time it became more and more prevalent. The Solonian Seisachtheia (from 100 to 73) corresponds pretty nearly to the abandonment of the Aeginetan standard in favour of the Euboic. About the same time Corinth, as well as Athens, also adopted the Euboic standard, but divided the unit or stater in a different ratio. Sicily also adopted the Euboic standard quite early. This fact is as a rule wrongly interpreted to mean that the Sicilian towns regulated their coinage by that of Athens, and adopted the Attic measure. Athens was credited very early with an influence in the west, which she did not really exercise. Sicily did not adopt the Attic, but the Euboic standard, as did Athens herself.

4. Death of Pheidon in an expedition against Corinth, Nic. Dam. fr. 41, Müller, who (M.) thinks this is not the tyrant of Argos, but a Corinthian legislator mentioned in Ar. Pol. As regards the successors of Pheidon, we find the following discrepancies among modern writers: according to Plass, Tyr. I. 70, his successor was Damocratidas; according to Busolt, Laked. 98, Lacedas (following Herod. 6, 127); according to Duncker, 5, 393, Eratus.

5. Struggles between Sparta and Argos, Paus. 3, 7, 2, and 3, 2, 2. A victory of the Spartan King Polydorus over the Argives is mentioned in Plut. Apophth. Lac. p. 231. The chronology of the Spartan and Argive border warfare cannot be satisfactorily established. The battle of Hysiae is mentioned by Paus. 2, 24, 7, and the date of it assumed to be 669. He says (3, 7, 5) that Θεοπόμπου ἔτι ἔχοντος τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐν Σπάρτῃ γίνεται καὶ ὁ περὶ τῆς Θυρεάτιδος καλουμένης χώρας Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀγὼν πρὸς Ἀργείους. Duncker, 5, 435, considers this incident to be the same as the fight at Hysiae, which is uncertain and involves chronological difficulties. —The fight of the Three Hundred, Herod. 1, 82, contemporaneous with the fall of Croesus; Str. 8, 376; Paus. 2, 38, 5. Cf. Bursian,

Geogr. v. Gr. 2, 69. If Othryadas killed himself afterwards, it shows that his action was more useful than honourable. Cf. Kohlmann, Othryades, Rh. M. 1874, 463 seq.

6. For Arcadia, Schwab, Arkadien, Stuttg. 1852; Bursian, G. v. Gr. 2, 181 seq.; Busolt, Die Lakedämonier, 111 seq., to whose reconstruction of the early history of Arcadia from legends Niese has raised well-founded objections.

7. Founding of the city of Mantinea, Strab. 8, 337. Bursian, 2, 209 places the Synoecismus definitely in the fifth century, but Busolt's cautious and less pronounced opinion (Lak. p. 125) appears to me to be more satisfactory. Origin of Tegea, Paus. 8, 45, 1.

8. Spartans waging war in Arcadia, Paus. 3, 2, 6; 3, 7, 3; 8, 48, 3; 8, 39, 2. It is not necessary to conclude from the distance of the city of Orchomenus from the Messenian frontier that all Arcadia took part in the second Messenian war; in any case those who lived between Orchomenus and the frontier did so. Aristocrates and his son Aristodemus ruled σχεδὸν πάσης Ἀρκαδίας, Diog. L. 1, 94.

9. Sparta, Tegea, Orestes Herod. 1, 66-70. Arist. ap. Plut. Qu. Gr. 5, on the stelé with the inscription on the Alpheius.

10. For the relations between Sparta, Olympia, the Pisatae and Eleans, cf. E. Curtius, Sparta und Olympia in the Hermes 14, 129 seq., and G. Busolt, Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte I., as well as his Lakedämonier I. The undertakings of the Pisatae are mentioned by Paus. 6, 22, 2. Cf. Str. 8, 355. Jul. Africanus, quoted in Euseb. Chron. 1, 198, Schöne, differs. Cf. Unger in the Philologus, 28 (1869).

11. For the ancient kings of Achaia see Polyb. 2, 41. When we reflect that Tisamenus according to the common legends did not come alive to Achaia, and that we know nothing of Gyges from other sources, and that for that reason (following Strabo, 384) it is usual to put in his place, as his name sounds too Lydian, an Ogyges, of whom we also know nothing, we must consider this section of ancient Greek history, although handed down by Polybius, to be as problematical as all others of that age. The twelve cities are enumerated by Herod. 1, 145. For Amarius, usually called Homarius, cf. Foucart, Rev. Arch. 1876, p. 96.

CHAPTER XVIII

NORTHERN GREEK STATES, ESPECIALLY THESSALY AND BOEOTIA. HESIOD

We do not propose to deal with the countries lying to the north of Thessaly here. They do not become of importance for the history of Greece until later. Yet their inhabitants even in early times need not all be regarded as barbarians. Their old coins with Greek inscriptions which have come down to us, prove that they were not so. We have them, not only from Macedonia, but also of the Thracian peoples such as the Bisaltae, the Edones, and the Orescii, and the latter even marked with the name of the tribe, a proof that these peoples felt themselves to be intellectually allied to the Greeks. The Greek towns on the coast had of course contributed much to this result. Still of the northern countries Thessaly was the only one of importance at that time for Greek history.

Thessaly may be generally described as the country of the Peneius, which flows towards the sea through the narrow picturesque vale of Tempe, and it may be appropriately represented as a huge basin, enclosed by lofty sides, and open only at one point; yet within this basin some parts are pretty clearly separated by elevations of the soil, to which the political divisions of the country may be traced. The western side is formed by Pindus, the eastern by Olympus, Ossa, and Pelion. But a third and lower range, intersected by the Peneius, traverses the interior of Thessaly in the same direc-

tion from north to south. To the west of this lies the upper Thessalian plain, which is again divided into a northern and southern portion, of which the former is watered by the Peneius itself, and the latter by its great tributaries, the most important being the Enipeus. Thessaly was from earliest times divided into four parts — Hestiaeotis, Thessaliotis, Pelasgiotis, and Phthiotis, to which is added a fifth in the country of the Magnetes. Of these Hestiaeotis contains the sources of the Peneius proper, with the adjoining mountains, Thessaliotis is the district of the Enipeus and the other rivers flowing from the south to the Peneius, Phthiotis comprises the mountain country (Othrys) and the sea-coast south of Thessaliotis, and Pelasgiotis, the plains of the lower Peneius east of the central range and the land lying to the south of them around Lake Boebeis; finally, the country of the Magnetes includes Ossa and Pelion. The most important places in Hestiaeotis were Gomphi, Ithome, Tricca (with the shrine of Asclepius); in Thessaliotis Arne (Cierium) and Pharsalus; in Pelasgiotis Larissa, Crannon, Pherae and Pagasae. Phthiotis and the country of the Magnetes had no cities of importance.

Little is known of the early political history of Thessaly. The ancestor of the nation is of course Thessalus. Some time after him Aleuas ruled, who wished to exclude one of his sons, Pyrrhus, from the succession. The Pythia had to draw lots, but Aleuas had put no lot into the urn for Pyrrhus; the brother of Aleuas, however, put one in, the Pythia drew it and confirmed the choice. Thus Pyrrhus became the successor of Aleuas. Whether the whole of Thessaly was ever really under a centralized hereditary government corresponding to what is described in these legends, is very doubtful. In really historical times we find there a number of aristocratically-governed states, united by the bond of kinship between the governing classes, and commanded, in case of a national war or other necessity, by the so-called Tagus, who, as late as after 500 B.C., was chosen

from the Aleuadae, who for a long time held a princely position in the most important towns of Thessaly, Pharsalus, and Larissa.[1]

The greater part of the country had been divided by the Thessalians among themselves. The conquered people who had not emigrated were degraded to the position of bondsmen. They were called Penestae, and resembled the Helots of Lacedaemon. They attempted to gain their liberty, but without success. Their first attempts took place while the Thessalians were still fighting with the Achaeans of Phthiotis, the Magnetes, and the Perrhaebi. A compromise was made with these tribes, and they were not degraded to the position of the Penestae. That a certain amount of independence was enjoyed by the Phthiotians, the Magnetes, and Perrhaebi is shown by their participation in the Amphictyonic League. The Thessalians kept the fertile plains for themselves, and left the mountainous districts to the aborigines. They developed into a wealthy nobility which was fond of horse-breeding. Thessalian nobles would sometimes take the field with hundreds of mounted followers. The Thessalians had the virtues and vices of rich aristocracies, hospitality, love of carousing, and party feuds. Life among the Thessalian nobles resembled that in the castles of the Middle Ages.

Proceeding from Thessaly to central Greece we find at first races under the influence of the Thessalians—the Dolopes upon the southern slopes of Pindus and the western spurs of Othrys, between Thessaly and Epirus; the Aenianes or Oetaeans in the valley of the Spercheius, between Othrys and Oeta, with their capital Hypata; and the Malians at the mouth of the Spercheius and on the eastern declivity of Oeta around the pass of Thermopylae. All these tribes were politically of no importance. The same may be said of those who were settled to the south of Mount Oeta in the interior and on the coast from the Malian Gulf up to the most northerly part of the Euboean Straits. These latter were chiefly Locrians, called Epicnemidii after the mountain-chain of Cnemis, and Opuntii

after the city of Opus, with two corresponding divisions of territory separated by a part of Phocis with the harbour of Daphnus. Thus the Phocian territory extended from sea to sea, from the Euboean Straits to the Gulf of Corinth. Its southern part embraced Mount Parnassus and the precincts of Delphi, which had to be treated as a separate district. Phocis proper was split up into a number of small republics, which had a central point of union in Phocium, situated to the west of Daulis and Panopus, on the road to Delphi. The best part of the Phocian territory was the valley of the Cephisus, in which were the most important Phocian cities, especially Elateia, which commanded the route into central Greece leading from Thermopylae to the south. The upper part of the Cephisus valley formed the district of Doris, small and not fertile, but famous as the birthplace of the conquerors of the Peloponnese. In former times this district was occupied by the Dryopes, who had to retreat before the Dorians and occupied Styra and Carystus in Euboea, the island of Cynthus, and finally Hermione and Asine in Argolis. If we look at these places on the map, we see that the Dryopes, starting from the Malian Gulf, avoided the mainland by a wide circuit, and settled on the extremities of the continent and in the islands. South of Doris begins the territory of the Ozolian Locri, which is narrow in the north, but expands in the south and includes a strip of coast of some importance on the Corinthian Gulf, reaching as far as Naupactus. The most important town in the interior was Amphissa. To the west of the Ozolian Locri came the Aetolians, who inhabited a large territory extending from the frontier of Epirus to the Ionian Sea. Aetolia was famous only in legend for the cities of Pleuron and Calydon, and was of little importance for Greece until quite late in its history, when the inhabitants, who had long remained more or less uncivilized, were called upon to exercise an important influence on the destiny of the whole country. The famous Aetolian cities lay in the neighbourhood of the coast, while the

subsequent capital, Thermon, was far in the interior. West of the Achelous comes the last Greek country, that of the Acarnanians, who in civilization were on a par with the Aetolians.

We must now return from the west to the east of Greece, to a country which in pre-Doric ages was one of the chief seats of Greek culture, and, in spite of what calumny may have said to the contrary, always remained so—we mean Boeotia.

Boeotia consists of two parts, fairly distinct from one another. The northern part has for the central point the Copaic Lake with its affluents, the largest of which is the Cephisus; it is separated by mountains from the Euripus and southern Boeotia, while Mount Helicon forms the boundary in the west. Southern Boeotia slopes downward towards both seas; Mount Cithaeron divides it from Attica and Megaris. In northern Boeotia Orchomenus was supreme; on the frontier-line of the two divisions lay Thebes, which from the flow of its streams belonged to the northern one. Southern Boeotia had better communication with the outside world than the northern, by reason of its two coast-lines and the proximity of Attica, while the latter part is convenient of access only from Euboea by the narrow strait of Chalcis. The names Boeotia and Euboea appear to belong to the same root.

The conquerors of Boeotia had come from the north, evidently by way of the valley of the Cephisus. Hence the first town of importance occupied by them must have been Chaeroneia. In all probability they then, leaving Orchomenus on the left, turned eastwards from a point south of the Copaic Lake, and passing Coroneia, near which the Thessalian Athene Itonia was worshipped, advanced against Thebes, and took it. From this city they made themselves masters of the country as far as Cithaeron. The Boeotians were at first ruled by kings, and according to the legend formed a single political state. Opheltas is said to have led them from Thessaly to Boeotia. But the son of Opheltas, Damasichthon, became king of Thebes, which must mean that the conquerors

did not obtain possession of Thebes until the second generation. Their further advance eastward is represented in the statement that the second successor of Damasichthon, Xanthus, invaded Attica. There is no record of the subjugation of Orchomenus, probably because it remained to a certain extent independent. The unity of the kingdom—if it ever did exist—ceased when the conquerors occupied more than one city. Thebes, however, always claimed the hegemony; she even maintained that the other Boeotian cities, even Plataea, had been founded by her colonists.[2]

In later times we find Boeotia organized as a federal state, under a governing body called Boeotarchs, of whom Thebes furnished two and the other cities one each. Of these cities the most important were—in the south, Tanagra, Plataea and Thespiae; in the centre, Haliartus, Coroneia, Lebadeia and Chaeroneia; lastly, Orchomenus or Erchomenus, always ranking as the second city in the country. The study of the coinage has thrown a welcome light on early Boeotian history.[3] It has been ascertained that the oldest Boeotian coins, belonging perhaps to the seventh century B.C., are oboli of Orchomenus, which have a marked family likeness to the Aeginetan coins, the *quadratum incusum* being precisely identical with that of the coins of Aegina, while the barley-corn, the token of Orchomenus, is represented in such a manner that it closely resembles the tortoise of Aegina. Orchomenus had evidently at that period more intercourse with foreign countries than the other Boeotian cities, and it made an alliance with Aegina, which is confirmed by the old tradition of its having belonged to the Calaurian League. In addition to these Orchomenian coins, we find a somewhat later federal coinage of Boeotia, with the Boeotian shield and several letters. The shield represented Boeotia, the letters the name of the city, either Thebes, Haliartus, or Tanagra.

Boeotia was the country where the poetry that had originated in Asia Minor first found acceptance and was continued in a somewhat different spirit. The Boeotian poet, whose

fame nearly equalled that of Homer, was Hesiod of Ascra. With him we leave the age of the mythological poets. His poems have enabled us to picture to ourselves his mode of life and surroundings. His family came from Cyme in Asia. Hesiod and his brother Perses were joint heirs of their father, but Perses with the help of unjust judges took unfair advantage of Hesiod. Tradition relates that the poet was killed in Locrian territory at Naupactus, and that dolphins carried the body ashore, which had been thrown into the sea by the murderers. All the works ascribed to Hesiod in antiquity have not come down to us, and everything that bears his name is not his. In the "Works and Days" he makes observations upon human life, and relates two legends which since then have become two of the most famous of antiquity, "Pandora's Box" and the "Four Ages of the World," and gives rules for navigation and agriculture. The relationship in which these two occupations are made to stand to each other is noteworthy. It is presumed that the man who has engaged in the cultivation of the soil up to the summer solstice will employ the following months in enriching himself by trading voyages. This recalls the connection between corn-growing Orchomenus and the islands of Aegina and Calauria. The second great poem ascribed to Hesiod is the Theogony. It is an attempt to solve the problem of the creation of the world, and at the same time to bring the recognized deities into genealogical relationship. It is thus a compound of popular theology and individual speculation. Of less importance is the third poem ascribed to him, and still extant, the "Shield of Heracles." What is of more importance, however, is that in antiquity other poems were ascribed to him which narrated the history of the Heroes, especially the Catalogue of Women and the Eoeae, in which the mortal women by whom the gods had had famous sons were placed at the head of each family. This was the origin of the tales of the descendants of Prometheus which afterwards became so popular, of Deucalion

and Pyrrha, of Hellen and the sons of Hellen, Dorus, Aeolus and Xuthus, whose sons were Achaeus and Ion.

It was said in antiquity that Homer and Hesiod created the gods for the Greeks. This assertion is correct only to this extent, that they supplied the nation with most of the ideas which people had of individual gods, and fixed the genealogical relations in which the gods stood to one another and to mankind. Homer gave them the former. The Greeks pictured Zeus to themselves as he is portrayed in Homer's memorable verse. But when the gods came to be regarded as tangible individualities, people wanted to know about their origin, and this they learned from Hesiod. Hesiod reduced the free creations of Homer to a scientific system. But all that Homer and Hesiod did was only part of the accessories of religion. The Greek religion was not created by poets; it was part and parcel of the character of the people. And the poets did not make any considerable change in it. For the anthropomorphic element existed in the Greek religion from the very beginning. Homer and Hesiod, that is, all the poets whose creations passed under those two names, only developed the germs existing in the popular mind into concrete individualities.

NOTES

1. Aleuas, etc., Plut. de am. frat. 21. Cf. the very complete article on the Aleuadae, by Westermann, in Pauly's R.E., I. 1^2. The legends of the universal rule of the Aleuadae in Thessaly originated probably in the ambitious ideas of later members of the family.—Characteristic traits in Arist. Pol. 2, 6, 2; 7, 11, 2; Thuc. 2, 101; 4, 78; Xen. Hell. 6, 18; Polyb. 18, 30; Strab. 440.—The position of Phthiotis Herod. 7, 173, 196, 198; Xen. Hell. 6, 1, 9.—Numerous cavalry, Xen. Hell. 6, 1, 7.

2. For the earlier history of Boeotia cf. Duncker, 5, 222, following Paus. 9, 1, 2; Plut. Cim. 1; de sera num. vind. 13; generally the article in Pauly's R.E., I. 2^2; the claims of Thebes, Thuc. 3, 61, 66. All the kings of Boeotia are quite as dubious as those of Arcadia, Thessaly and Achaia.

3. Barclay V. Head, On the chronological sequence of the coins of Boeotia, Lond. 1881. Num. Chron., ser. III., vol. I.

CHAPTER XIX

BONDS OF UNION AMONG THE GREEKS. AMPHICTYONES, ORACLES, GAMES

HESIOD has asserted that his nation was of one race. He could not have invented this unity of race, which he was the first of the poets to proclaim. He merely put into words the thoughts and feelings of the people. The name henceforth given to the whole nation was that of Hellenes. How this name came to predominate we can only conjecture. In Homer Hellas [1] is only the country of Achilles, and Hellenes are people who follow Achilles, consequently inhabitants of Phthiotis. We next come upon the name of Hellenes farther west. Around Dodona dwelt the Selloi or Helloi, and, as Aristotle says,[2] the people who at that time were called Graicoi but are now called Hellenes. Achilles offered prayer to the Zeus of Dodona. This, however, only brings us farther back in point of time. But we do not know how it came about that the name which the people of Achilles bore became the designation of all the Greeks; for the statement of Thucydides that Hellen and his sons gradually became so powerful in Phthiotis, that their alliance was sought on all sides, and that thus more and more people were called Hellenes, is only an application of the favourite eponymous theory to the particular case and proves nothing.[3] In Homer the ancient Greeks are called Achaeans. Why were they afterwards called Hellenes? According to the genealogies, which

were first recited by Hesiod, and, after many changes in detail, found general acceptance, Amphictyon is a brother of Hellen; from which it may be concluded that the Greeks assumed a close connection between the Amphictyonic League and the name of Hellenes. If we consider that the peoples which originally formed the League were so grouped that the Phthiotian Achaeans may be regarded as living in the centre, and that these very Achaeans were the oldest known Hellenes, it is natural to conclude that all the members of the Amphictyonic League called themselves now and again Hellenes, probably on account of a certain ascendency of the Phthiotians. The Dorians introduced the common name into the Peloponnese. It was, however, used more generally afterwards when the Greeks had planted colonies in Asia. Here it met with general acceptance owing to the contrast between Hellenic culture and that of the barbarians of Asia.

The things which were common to the Greeks and made them one nation, Herodotus considers to be the following: blood relationship or a common descent, common religion and language, and lastly, similar manners and customs. The first, common descent, was in a literal sense a mere assumption of the ancients, for they could have known nothing of the descent of all Hellenes from one common ancestor. Moreover, only Dorians, Ionians, Aeolians and Achaeans, were included in this community of descent, and of these four, two, the Achaeans and Aeolians, were very vaguely defined. Their theory of common descent is a fiction, and is only of value when it embraces those who speak the same language. We must, therefore, assume that all who were regarded as Hellenes spoke dialects which the Greeks themselves considered to be allied to each other. Thus, the first criterion of Herodotus, identity of origin, is not demonstrable with the resources at our command. And, perhaps, Herodotus and his contemporaries could not prove it; they probably contented themselves with the general im-

pression conveyed by the language and customs of a race, and especially the latter.

The other criteria adduced by Herodotus, common religion, and similar manners and customs, are more easy for us to establish in the case of those who were considered as Greeks, although even in these respects the Greek and barbarian elements are scarcely distinguishable one from the other on the northern frontier and in Asia.[4]

The common religion of the Greeks must be considered here from a twofold point of view. In the first place, the same gods were worshipped everywhere by the Greeks, although their attributes might be different in different places. Olympus was in the eyes of every Greek inhabited by the same deities; the distinctions already noticed, *e.g.* between the Artemis of Ephesus and the Artemis of Delos, did not strike the popular mind. If an inhabitant of Athens had much the same idea of Apollo, for instance, as an inhabitant of Sparta, it was also possible that certain places of worship held in particularly high esteem might exercise an influence beyond the boundaries of the state in which they were situated, and in this way they became a bond of union for the nation, or at all events for a part of it. And this is the second point to which we wish to draw attention. The link which united neighbouring Greek peoples consisted at first only of common worship, more especially of common sacrifices offered at certain shrines. These common religious rites had the effect of bringing the participant states into a certain kind of political relation to one another, although the positive results of this nature were of course not the same everywhere.[5] Thus the inhabitants of different cities grouped themselves round the temple of Poseidon at Onchestus, in the territory of the Boeotian city Haliartus, round the sanctuary of Athene Itonia, in the territory of Coronea, and round the temple of Poseidon in the island of Calauria. The last-mentioned league was distinguished by the name Amphictyony; it was a confederacy

embracing Troizene, Hermione, Nauplia, Prasiae, Epidaurus, Aegina, Athens and the Boeotian Orchomenus. In later times two larger cities, Argos and Sparta, took the place of Nauplia and Prasiae. On the Triopian promontory at Cnidus, the inhabitants of the Dorian colonies of Asia Minor and the adjacent islands met for the worship of the Triopian Apollo. On the promontory of Mycale in the district of Priene the twelve Ionic city-communities of Asia Minor assembled to worship the Heliconian Poseidon. The name of an Amphictyony was given to the league for the worship of Apollo at Delos, at the head of which stood Athens, whence every year sailed a ship with special envoys to the birthplace of Apollo. The Euboean cities had, as it seems, a religious centre in the shrine of Artemis Amarynthia at Eretria; the Triphylian cities (Peloponnese) had theirs in the temple of Poseidon on the hill of Samicum by the sea-shore. But the most important religious confederacy of the whole Greek nation was that with the special name of Amphictyonic League,[6] the original centre of which was the temple of Demeter at Anthela in the country of the Malians, close to the pass of Thermopylae, and between the sea and the crags of Oeta, which rise abruptly to the south; the second centre of it was the temple of Apollo at Delphi. Twelve peoples composed the League: — the Malians, the Phthiotian Achaeans, the Aenianes or Oetaeans, the Dolopes, the Magnetes, the Perrhaebi, the Thessalians, the Locrians, the Dorians, the Phocians, the Boeotians, and the Ionians. The League thus included races which at a later date differed widely in importance. We see that its origin dated from a time when the Dorians had not conquered the greater part of the Peloponnesus. We see moreover that originally it was a union of the inhabitants of Thessaly and central Greece, all north of the Peloponnese. Each member of the League had equal voting power, and each sent two envoys, called Hieromnemones, accompanied by Pylagorae, to the meetings, which were held twice a year, in spring and autumn, at Anthela and

at Delphi. The object of the Amphictyonic League was not merely the offering of sacrifice at the altars at Anthela and Delphi, but also the preservation of certain laws which regulated the relations between the Amphictyonic states. They did not go so far as to say that peace should always prevail between the allied states—that would have been a Utopia—but they wished to ensure the observance of at all events certain rules of humanity if war did break out. Besides this, the League had the special duty of protecting the Delphic sanctuary. Of the special resolutions of the Amphictyones which are known as a matter of history several have reference to the protection of the Delphic sanctuary. Four so-called sacred wars, in B.C. 595, 355, 340, and 280, were brought about by the Amphictyones, on occasions when the Crisaeans, the Phocians, the Amphissaeans and the Aetolians had violated the territory of Delphi or had committed acts of extortion on pilgrims going thither. In other resolutions the Amphictyones appear as representatives of the common sentiments of the Hellenes, but almost always with special reference to worship. When it is a question of putting up monuments in Delphi to commemorate deeds of patriotism, they always assume the character of guardians of the Delphic sanctuary. The erection by them of a monument on the spot to those who had fallen at Thermopylae, and the outlawry of the traitor Ephialtes, are an indication that the district of Thermopylae, on account of its proximity to the temple of Demeter at Anthela, was under their special supervision. The motion brought forward by the Spartans after the battle of Plataea to exclude those Greek states which had taken no part in the war against the Persians from the Amphictyonic League, may be interpreted as part of the internal business of the League. The Amphictyones could prescribe arbitration instead of war between weak states, but strong ones always resorted to the arbitrament of war. The imposition of a fine upon Sparta, because she had fraudulently seized the Cadmea, shows in what way international law ought

always to have been enforced among the Greeks, and that it was enforced only in exceptional cases. Besides, what was the use of imposing a money fine if the robber kept his booty? The authority of the Amphictyonic League was like that of many federal assemblies with vaguely defined powers, very slight in the ordinary course of affairs, and liable to abuse from ambitious and powerful members on extraordinary occasions.

The union of Greece was further preserved by means of the oracles, especially that of Delphi, the temple of which was under the care of the Amphictyones.[7] This influence of religion on the collective life of Greece belongs to post-Homeric times. We find sacerdotal authority at its highest in the period between the Dorian invasion and the Persian wars. The cause seems to be connected with the growth of new theories respecting the nature of the great crimes committed by mankind. At first murder was regarded as something that concerned only the family and could be settled by the family. The need for religious expiation of the crime did not enter into their minds. In the age after the Dorian invasion the feeling became general that a murder left a stain on the criminal and his kin, and that he could and must make atonement by means of certain ceremonies. These ceremonies were performed by the priests of Apollo, especially at certain highly sacred spots. Apollo effected the reconciliation between the guilty persons and the divine power, called Zeus or the God, and gradually assumed the position of general mediator between the deity and man. In practice, the duty of the mediator usually consisted in informing the suppliants whether and in what way they could attain the object which they had at heart.[8] In Delphi, the chief seat of the worship of Apollo, this communication was made in especially solemn fashion.

The sacred precinct of Pytho lay at the southern base of Parnassus, in a ravine, from the farthest recess of which the famous spring Castalia gushed forth. At the foot of the western precipice was the temple of Apollo, in which lay the

Omphalos, a stone shaped like the half of an egg and supposed to mark the centre of the earth, at which two eagles sent forth by Zeus from the east and west had met; golden effigies of them stood beside the stone. Over a cleft in the ground in the Adytum stood a large tripod, upon which the Pythia sat when she gave her decisions. These were taken down by a priest—prophetes—who stood by her, and were afterwards put into verse. The oracle belonged originally to Ge, next to Themis, and lastly to Apollo, who had killed the serpent Pytho on this spot, and had driven on the neighbouring coast of Crisa a ship manned by Cretans, who were to be his servants at the shrine. At first the Pythia delivered her replies only during a particular month, but afterwards at all times and seasons. And the oracle was consulted not merely by private individuals, but by the states themselves, especially in religious matters, but just as often also in questions of politics. If, for instance, there was a question of legislation or of sending out a colony, the proposed laws and the spot where the settlement was to be planted had to be agreeable to the deity.

Although the answers of the oracle were always framed so as to give full play to the sagacity of the questioner, which also ensured that the failure of an undertaking apparently sanctioned by the oracle could be always ascribed to a wrong interpretation of it, yet a wide knowledge of Greek affairs was necessary to prevent the replies from gradually falling into disrepute by their want of meaning. The Delphic priests had to be acquainted with the position of affairs in the different Greek states, and as there were always a number of people at Delphi who had come thither either as envoys or in their own private interests, they were kept informed of all important matters, and moreover had leisure to study them, as the gifts brought to the temple constituted their chief source of livelihood. We need not, however, credit the priests of Delphi with extraordinary wisdom. That in colonization, for instance, they showed a statesman-like insight into details, even to the

selection of particular spots, and remarkable geographical knowledge, and that they really directed the colonization of Greece, is a very common but an erroneous idea. The choice of the place where the colony was to be planted was determined by the interests of the mother-country or of the emigrants. If the Pythia specified the spot where a colony was to be founded, if, for example, the Spartans were directed to Tarentum and the Corinthians to Ortygia, the most natural construction is that people in Sparta and Corinth had arrived at the conclusion that these spots could be conveniently colonized, and that the oracle was therefore requested to convey its sanction to the project. To keep up the form of leaving the initiative to the god was in the interest both of the questioner and the oracle, and is consonant with the nature of religion.[9]

Oracles and especially the Delphic oracle were appealed to also for the regulation of domestic affairs. Thus the legislation of Lycurgus received its sanction from Delphi; Solon was commanded by the Pythia to take into his hands the helm of the state; and the laws of Zaleucus were given to the Locri Epizephyrii at the bidding of the Delphic god. No one, however, will conclude from this that the contents of the laws originated with the priests of Delphi, or even assume that they had discovered that Athens and Locri required new laws and that Solon and Zaleucus were suitable men to draw them up. We may say that the Delphic oracle was in certain respects the highest court of appeal for public affairs, with the proviso that inquiry was only made when it was considered advisable, and that there was no obligation to follow the advice of the oracle. It was a kind of tribunal, not a legislative body. It is true that at times it availed itself of the opportunity of giving its advice on matters quite foreign to the subject of the particular question.[10] The Spartan state must have stood in particularly close relationship to the Delphic oracle, as we find there a special court consisting of two men, the Pythioi,

who mediated between the kings and Delphi. For the rest, Delphi had a great reputation not only among the Greeks, but also among foreign nations. Thus we find the Phrygians and Lydians applying to the oracle as early as the reigns of Midas and Gyges, and afterwards under the other kings of the Mermnadic dynasty. The Romans also are said to have had recourse to it under the younger Tarquinius. We see from this that in very early times foreign nations were influenced by the peculiar civilization of the Greeks, and that the Delphic oracle was everywhere considered as the authoritative exponent of Greek religious views.[11] We may say that whenever its influence touched the region of morals, it made itself felt in the sense of moderation and avoidance of all extremes, which we have seen to be a characteristic ornament of the Greek mind. Its supervision of the Greek religion had the effect of preventing the circle of recognized deities being invaded by the arbitrary admission of new ones. The oracle also took care that polytheism should not completely obliterate the higher feeling of divine unity, by representing Apollo, not as an independent god, but as the mouthpiece of the will of Zeus, as his prophetes; it also on fitting occasions inculcated certain moral principles, *e.g.* as regards expiation of the crime of murder and avoidance of revenge for bloodshed. It also exercised a moral influence upon the collective life of the Greeks by means of the short sentences which were written up in the portico of the temple, among which the most famous was γνῶθι σεαυτόν, "know thyself." These sayings were ascribed to the seven wise men, some to Cheilon alone; they exactly express the true Greek character, which is perhaps most clearly revealed in the precept μηδὲν ἄγαν (*ne quid nimis*). It was undoubtedly in this sense that the Delphic oracle always delivered its decisions, and in this sense it endeavoured to make its influence felt in all directions. It seems to have contributed greatly to the civilization of the Greek nation during the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries B.C.[12]

Its influence was thus a moderating one, that is to say, directed against what was evil and prejudicial, but the oracle did not, as has often been believed in modern times, inspire the nation with positive ideas or point out new paths. It has been supposed that in certain epochs of Greek history almost everything great and important was inspired by Delphi, as for example, the calendar, road-making, Doric architecture, and even the doctrines of Pythagoras. It is probably true that the Delphic priests made their influence felt in some of these matters; they certainly devoted their attention to the calendar systems of the Greek states, and their own interests required that the roads in the vicinity of their shrine should be kept in good order. That, however, was influence of a local character. But that they exercised any marked influence on the development of the Doric style is neither proved nor probable. It is not even known that they specially cultivated the study of architecture, and the requirements of a temple so peculiar as that at Delphi were not calculated to inspire the priests with an interest in the correct and harmonious arrangement of ordinary temples. Finally, the view held in antiquity that Pythagoras was a kind of messenger of the Delphic god, who used him as a mouthpiece, was probably only a fanciful interpretation of the name Pythagoras, and no positive fact can be adduced in support of it.

As regards the part assigned to the priests of Delphi, as creators of grand and fruitful ideas, there are two facts which are difficult of explanation. In the first place, how it came about that a small country population, which did not, like certain colleges or orders, recruit its numbers from among able men belonging to all places and to all nations, achieved such success by means of hereditary talent, and in the second place, why it was that no single individual coveted fame, but that all deprecated the honour of having originated these great ideas.[13] Creative genius is not hereditary in a country district, and when genius does appear on the scene it demands recognition.

If what is ascribed to the Delphic priests is true, they must have been the rulers of Greece, and we should have found a theocracy in Hellas, which in reality never existed. The fact that there was no perceptible opposition to the part played by Delphi proves that the priests were not men of genius. For only mediocrity, which is always ready to be of service to those who apply to it, meets with permanent and universal appreciation. Every state was on good terms with Delphi; which shows that the oracle did not take the lead, but as a rule knew how to convey a religious sanction to the very thing that was desired by the applicants. If Delphi sometimes opposed the wishes of a state, it only did so in order to maintain the authority of the oracle. Occasionally the intrigues, the results of which were the so-called utterances of the god, were discovered, or, what came to the same thing, were supposed to be discovered, but even in cases of this kind the priests knew how to get out of the difficulty. In case of need the Pythia was sacrificed as a scape-goat. It did not even injure the prestige of the Delphic oracle in the long-run when it "medised" at the beginning of the great Persian war by encouraging the Argives and Cretans in the neutrality which was so detrimental to Greek interests,[14] and by endeavouring to discourage the Athenians. It maintained its reputation at the eleventh hour by seeing at the right moment which party had the better chance of success, and then going over without hesitation to the patriotic side. This incident proves that, as far as the oracle itself was concerned, the national cause was a matter of indifference to it, and we may even go so far as to say that taken as a whole it was just as much an oracle for barbarians as for Greeks.

Delphi was also connected with the third link in the chain which served to bind the Greeks together, the national Games or Festivals, of which there were four: the Olympic, the Pythian, the Nemean, and the Isthmian, while the other festivals, however famous, had a more local character. The

immense importance of these games in Greek life was derived from a national peculiarity. To the Greek the admiration of his fellow-citizens was one of the most desirable of things, and his innate ambition impelled him to distinguish himself from the crowd, and to desire to stand higher than others in the opinion of the nation. A public competition seemed to him the best method of determining the merit of different individuals. The great importance of these contests in the development of Greek culture is proved by the fact that the prize-competitions of dramatic poets held at Athens during the Dionysia materially promoted the rise of tragedy and comedy.

The Olympic Games were celebrated in the sacred precinct belonging to the Pisatae, which bore the name of Olympia,[15] and was situated on the Alpheius (about seven miles from the sea as the crow flies, and about eleven by river) at a point where a stream, named Cladeus, flows from the north into the Alpheius. The festival was founded by Heracles, but according to some by Pisus, the eponymous hero of Pisa, and according to others by Pelops. Of these heroes Pelops was the most honoured in Olympia. As Pelops was the ancestor of the lords of a great part of the Peloponnese, who were dislodged by the Heraclidae, his cult must have been older than that of Heracles, even in Olympia, as the latter does not appear to have ever had a temenos there, and was probably not regarded as the founder of the festival until a later period. We may assume that it had been a long time in existence when it was re-established in the reign of Lycurgus. At that period Elis, which had submitted to the Pisatae, was ruled by Iphitus, who received instructions from the oracle to restore the festival. For this purpose he joined with Lycurgus, and it was agreed that during the festival all hostilities should cease between the states who participated in it. So runs the tradition. In the time of Pausanias (second cent. A.D.) a discus could be seen in the Heraeum at Olympia, upon which

were written the names of Iphitus and Lycurgus. It is a fact that Sparta always showed great interest in the prosperity of the Olympic Games, and it is probable that she used this quasi-official position of protectress of Olympia for political purposes. The Eleans claimed continuous peace and the inviolability of their territory, but to this claim no attention was paid. On the other hand, a sacred truce was always observed during the festival. Those who violated it by molesting travellers to Olympia had to pay fines in money. Every Greek state took part in the Olympic festival. At first it was naturally confined to the neighbouring peoples, but the number of those who took part in it gradually increased.

It was usual for the different states to send deputations to the Olympic Games, as in the case of important sacrifices and festivals. The festival itself was pentaeteric; it was held every fourth year about the second full moon after the summer solstice. The sacrifices to Zeus and the other gods were originally the chief functions, but these soon yielded in importance to the contests held in honour of the gods. The first and for a long time the only contest was the foot race, which was run in the stadium, the course being 600 Olympic feet in length. The winner of this race was considered the chief victor in the Olympic Games, and the Olympiad was named after him. But these records, with the number of the Olympiad, do not begin till 776 B.C. In that year Coroebus was victor, and this was called the first Olympiad. The general use, however, of the Olympiad as the basis of Greek chronology did not become customary till a much later period, chiefly owing to the historian Timaeus of Tauromenium, in the third century B.C. In the 18th Olympiad the foot race was supplemented by the Pentathlon, which consisted of five contests: jumping, running, throwing the discus, casting the javelin, and wrestling; and besides these, wrestling as a special contest by itself. In the 23rd Olympiad boxing was

added, and in the 25th a competition which served only for purposes of display, the chariot-race, which was held in the hippodrome that ran south of the stadium and parallel with it. The foot-race proved the victor's agility; the Pentathlon his strength combined with activity; the chariot-race his wealth. The winner was not the charioteer but the owner of the chariot and horses; and to keep up a chariot and four involved considerable expense. Thus the chariot-race was an easy means of displaying wealth and acquiring popularity with one's fellow-citizens. The tyrants frequently resorted to it, and found poets to uphold them in their endeavours. Thus a portion of the fame, which was really due to personal exertions, was transferred to people who had no other merit than that of the wealthy individual whose lavishness confers a lustre upon himself and his native place. For in the case of the chariot-race the city shared in the fame of the winner, who sometimes for personal reasons gave the name of a foreign city instead of his own. It also sometimes happened that the winner did not have his own name proclaimed, but that of some other person—a not over-refined kind of flattery. The fact that such notorious falsehoods attained their object shows how naïvely the Greeks gave themselves up to the enjoyment of public fame.

Virgins, barbarians, and slaves were allowed to look on at the games. The Hellanodicae, nominated by the Eleans, officiated as stewards and judges. The money paid in fines was spent in brazen images of Zeus, the so-called Zanes, which were put up in the sacred precinct. The prize was a wreath from the wild olive which had been planted in Olympia by Heracles. Special honours awaited the victor on his return to his native place. He made his entry in a carriage drawn by four white horses, accompanied by his friends, and met with a splendid reception. He deposited his wreath of victory as an offering in one of the chief temples of the city. For the remainder of his life he was a privileged

person. A seat of honour was assigned to him in the theatre, and often board at the public expense was granted to him for life. In some cities gifts of money even were made to the victor. In Sparta he was given a place of honour near the king in battle. After the 59th or 61st Olympiad the victors were allowed to erect their own statues in Olympia, but the statue was only allowed to represent the features of the victor when he had won three times.

As Greeks flocked from every district and from every city to be present at the festival, in later times writers seized the opportunity of bringing their works under public notice; thus Herodotus is said to have recited part of his history there, and rhetoricians displayed their art, as Gorgias with his Olympic speech; artists also exhibited their works there. And men who on their appearance as spectators at Olympia were welcomed with honour by the people, as happened to Themistocles, regarded such a reception as the highest reward of their patriotic labours.

The place occupied by the Olympic festival in Greek life was one of the most peculiar and important that can well be imagined. At Olympia activity, as distinct from physical strength, earned the highest honours which Greece was able to bestow, for victory in the foot-race always came first. And this is characteristic of the Greek people, who were never impressed by mere strength; success in the foot-race necessitated a harmonious physical development. But the great honours paid to victors had also a religious signification; the body was developed to the glory of Zeus. Thus the pursuit of the beautiful in the service of religion became through Olympia one of the chief factors in Greek education, which placed beauty of proportion in the front rank. But the Olympic Games were of direct assistance to the most perfect of the Greek arts. The naked body was displayed in the games, and it is the naked body which the sculptor has to represent. Hence the artists of Greece became accustomed to the repro-

duction of real nature, and of a beautiful and vigorous form of it. If they had not much opportunity of making likenesses of the face, this mattered little at the outset for the development of the plastic art. An art trained in the representation of the body could soon make good this deficiency.

Moreover the statues of the victors were not the only subjects for art at Olympia. Offerings of all kinds were placed there, and the erection of the various sacred buildings made important demands on architecture and religious and decorative plastic art. Thus in the course of centuries the place became a great museum, which we have hitherto known chiefly through the detailed description given of it by Pausanias in his travels through Greece. In the last few years the long-cherished wish of archaeologists has been fulfilled, and the scene of the Olympic festival has been cleared by excavations, instigated by E. Curtius and carried on at German expense, to the great advantage of history.

The most important part of the scene was the Altis, to the east of which were the places for the contests, such as the stadium and hippodrome. The Altis, *i.e.* Alsos, or sacred grove, lay to the north of the Alpheius and to the east of the Cladeus, which here joins the Alpheius; to the north of it rose the hill of Cronos. Between its shady trees hung with offerings there were originally simple altars of rough stone covered with the ashes of the sacrifice; but gradually large temples were erected there to Hera, to Zeus, and to the mother of the gods, as also the enclosures sacred to Pelops and Hippodameia. The centre of the sacred precinct was filled by the gigantic primitive altar of Zeus. On a terrace to the north were the treasure-houses and small sanctuaries, erected by various cities for the reception of the gifts sent by them to Olympia. Those which we can identify belonged to Sicyon, Syracuse, Epidamnus, Byzantium, Sybaris, Cyrene, Selinus, Metapontum, Megara, and Gela. It is noteworthy that of these ten treasure-houses, only those of Sicyon and Megara belong to

European Greece proper; that of Byzantium belonged to an oriental colony, that of Cyrene to an African, that of Epidamnus to an Illyrian, those of Metapontum and Sybaris to Italian, and lastly Syracuse, Selinus and Gela to Sicilian colonies. Thus the west distinctly predominates, and the recognition of its dependence on Greece finds marked expression in the interest shown in Olympia. For Olympia, as has been rightly observed, looks towards the west. The Alpheius also points westwards, and re-appears in the Sicilian Ortygia; in the west, in Sicily, the interest taken in the Olympic Games is characteristically expressed by the chariot and four depicted on the coins. Thus Olympia was the highest bond which linked the western colonies to Greece. It is remarkable that, with the two exceptions of Sybaris and Metapontum, only Dorian cities possessed treasure-houses. The Dorians evidently felt their connection with Olympia to be an especially close one.[16]

The Pythian Games were less important than those of Olympia.[17] Before the first Sacred War, a competition between cithara-players had been held every eighth year at Delphi, where they performed a paean to Apollo. When in consequence of that war the plain of Crisa became the property of the Delphic god, contests after the manner of those at Olympia were added to the singing competitions and held in the plain. The first competition in this enlarged form was celebrated in the third year of the 48th Olympiad. From thenceforth it took place every fourth year, in the third year of the Olympiad. The chief event, however, was always the so-called Pythian Nomos, a composition in honour of the Pythian Apollo, which was performed on the flute. The judges were appointed by the Amphictyons, and the prize was a wreath of laurel.

The Nemean Games[18] were celebrated in a lonely wooded valley, named Nemea, belonging to the small Argive town of Cleonae. Originally there was a festival on this spot in honour of the hero Archemoros or Opheltes, then the worship of

Zeus was introduced and games were dedicated to him in the 51st Olympiad. The festival was managed at first by the Cleonaeans and afterwards generally by the Argives. It was held twice every four years, once in summer and once in winter. The contests were as at Delphi gymnastic, equestrian and musical; the victor received a wreath of parsley. Three columns of the Nemean temple are standing to this day, but all the rest of the temple has been overthrown by earthquakes, which have laid the drums of the columns in regular rows on the ground beside one another.

The fourth great national festival, the Isthmian Games,[19] was held on the Isthmus of Corinth, originally in honour of Melicertes, and then of Poseidon, whom Theseus had established here as tutelar deity. The games were organized as they existed in historical times about the same time as the Pythian and Nemean, 586 or 582 B.C. They were gymnastic, equestrian and musical; the prize was originally a chaplet of parsley, afterwards a pine-garland. The Athenians took a specially prominent part in these games, which were held on Dorian territory, and paid a prize of 100 drachmae to the Athenian victors.

The principal effect of the four great festivals was to exhibit all the Greeks united in the common practice of their religion, and in the common observance of their customs, pursuing the same aims of physical and intellectual improvement, and at peace with one another for at least a small part of the year, even though war might be raging among the various states.

NOTES

1. Homer, Il. 16, 594; 2, 683.
2. Graeci and Hellenes in Ar. Met. 1, 353.
3. For the spread of the name Hellenes, cf. Thuc. 1, 3.
4. Institutions, etc., common to the Greeks according to Herod. 8, 144. Acc. to Thuc. 2, 80, the Epirotes were barbarians, yet they had some kings with Greek names. The distinction between

the Greeks and barbarians is one of the impressions which the reading of Herodotus' history produces. By his representations of the actions of Greeks and barbarians, and his repeated descriptions of the institutions and mode of life of non-Hellenic nations, Herodotus makes us feel how much more humane the Greeks were than the barbarians, in spite of all their faults.

5. Common worship at Onchestus, Strab. 9, 412. Worship of Athene Itonia, Paus. 9, 34, 1. In the island of Calauria, Strab. 8, 375. E. Curtius (Der Seebund von Calauria, Hermes 10, 386 seq.) has endeavoured to show that it was not the Boeotian, as he formerly supposed, but the Arcadian Orchomenus which belonged to the League ; we noticed, however, above traces of a connection between the Boeotian Orchomenus and Aegina on coins. In the Triopian promontory, Herod. 1, 144. On the promontory of Mycale, Herod. 1, 148 ; Strab. 14, 633. Delos, Thuc. 3, 104 ; Plut. Thes. 21 ; Paus. 8, 48, 2 : cf. Herm. St. A.[5] 12, 5. Artemis Amarynthia, Strab. 10, 448. On the Samicon, Str. 8, 343. Cf. Müller's Amphiktyonieen in Pauly's R.E. I.[2]

6. The Amphictyonic League, Schöm. 2, Abschn. 4, 2. The list of members can be made out from Paus. 10, 8, 2 and Aesch. f. leg. 116 ; the Amphictyonic oath in Aesch. f. leg. 115, where τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ specially refers to the Delphic temple. Decree concerning the inscription (Dem.) c. Neaer. 98. About Thermopylae, Herod. 7, 228 and 213. Motion of the Spartans, Plut. Them. 20. Award between Melos and Cimolos, Lebas, Voy. Arch. III. n. 1. Fine imposed on the Spartans, Diod. 16, 23 and 29. Fine imposed for piracy on the Dolopians of Scyros, Plut. Cim. 8.

7. On the Delphic oracle cf. the article by Preller in Pauly's R.E. II. the only fault of which is that it attaches too much importance to the oracle ; Göttling, Ges. Abh. II., also Schömann, Bd. 2, IV. 3 and V. 11. Geography of Delphi, Bursian, G. v. Gr. I. 170 seq. and Baedeker. Hom. Hymn. ad Ap. Pyth. (where the name Delphi is not yet given to it, but only Crisa). Earlier possessors of the oracle, Aesch. Eumen. init. Oracles delivered at first only in the month Βύσιος (Πύθιος), Plut. Qu. Gr. 9. The Pythian priests in Sparta, Herod. 6, 57; Suidas s.v. Delphi an object of respect in Phrygia : Midas, Herod. 1, 14 ; in Lydia: Gyges, Herod. 1, 13, 14 ; Alyattes, 1, 19, and further the whole narrative concerning Croesus. For the Delphic utterances, Göttling, Ges. Abh. II. 221-250. Recent local researches in Delphi, beginning with E. Curtius down to those of French scholars, especially Wescher and Foucart, have contributed information concerning its later history, which throws light upon Greek life as a whole. Extensive excavations are now being carried on at Delphi at the expense of France.

8. The functions of Apollo had so far an external element, that he in general only demanded certain ceremonies of a formal character. Natures with more depth of feeling perceived that man in order to become really free from sin must assimilate certain ideas and convictions. This led to the mysteries.—A second centre of the worship of Apollo was Delos, which boasted of being in connection with Lycia on the one side and with the Hyperboreans on the other ; cf. Herod. 4, 32-36 ; Abaris and Aristeas appear as *prophetae* of Apollo in this connection (Arimaspi, Proconnesus and Metapontum). Athens maintained a close intercourse with Delos. In the route—Hyperboreans, Carystos, Tenos, Delos (Herod. 4, 33) —I see traces of intimate relations between Miletus, Eretria and Athens.

9. As regards the influence of the Delphic oracle on Greek colonization we must revert to the earlier view, expressed in Hermann's St. A.[5] § 75, according to which the colonizing parties "were sent forth with the customary formalities, in which was included a decision of the oracle." It is often supposed nowadays that the Delphic oracle directed not only the intellectual and religious life of the Greeks, but also their colonization. Apart from single utterances of the oracle, in which places to be colonized were indicated, the only passage which supports this view is Cic. Divin. 1, 1, 3 : Quam vero Graecia coloniam misit, in Aeoliam, Ioniam, Asiam, Siciliam, Italiam sine Pythio aut Dodonaeo aut Hammonis oraculo ? aut quod bellum susceptum ab ea sine consilio Deorum est ? Here the second question, as to war, shows the meaning of the first relating to colonization. Just as a Greek state never waged war without consideration of its own advantage, so it never sent a colony to any spot which it did not approve. And just as the Greeks and Romans obtained favourable signs from the gods for their military undertakings, so they procured them when founding a colony. In Herod. 4, 159, the Pythia directs all Hellenes to Cyrene :—ἐπεκαλέοντο γὰρ οἱ Κυρηναῖοι. In those days people bespoke an oracle in the same way as they now set the Press in motion when something important is on the *tapis*. The oracle in Herod. 4, 159, for example, is in the style of modern puffs : early application for shares is necessary to prevent disappointment ! (Colonies as joint-stock enterprises, Thuc. 1, 27. A share in the founding of Syracuse is said to have been sold for a cake.) Moreover, Cicero's words do not bear out the vast importance ascribed to Delphi, as they place it on a level with Dodona and the Libyan Oasis. If Dodona and Ammon could achieve as much as Delphi, then the achievement was nothing more than a formality. And what Cicero does not prove, cannot be proved by individual

decisions of the oracle (*e.g.* Diod. VIII.) as to the places chosen for colonization, for there is always a strong suspicion that they were fabricated after the event. It is not likely that the oracle was less ambiguous in dealing with the settlement of a colony than in other cases. Let us consider the following points with regard to an oracle like that concerning Tarentum, even supposing it to be genuine. The Italian coast was as well or as imperfectly known to the Greeks of the eighth century as western Africa is to us. When the Pythia said : found, *i.e.* take possession of, Croton or Tarentum, it was far from certain where these places were to be found. The play on names in oracles and prophecies is well known ; the place where the prediction is fulfilled is invariably that indicated by the oracle. If the settlement turned out a failure, the reason was that they had not hit upon the right place. But the oracle which a colonizing expedition took with it had a practical signification of great importance. It legitimized the undertaking and gave it a privileged position as regards others—always subject, however, to the proviso that the true meaning of the oracle was discovered. The well-known pronouncement of Pope Alexander VI. legalized the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in precisely similar fashion. Alexander's decision does not prove that there were learned geographers at the Papal court, it merely proves that a religious authorization was desired by colonizing nations at that period, and this was exactly the case in Greece.

10. The *rôle* of the Pythia consisted in conveying the necessary religious sanction to important decisions, even in domestic affairs. This was expressed by the words : "The Delphic oracle has ordered it." If we take a statement of this kind in its literal sense, we make a mistake. Hence Preller in the Article quoted above (p. 908) is of opinion that the names of the Phylae of Cleisthenes were fixed by injunction from Delphi ("attested by word of mouth," according to Paus. 10, 10, 1), while it is clear that the plans of Cleisthenes, even as regards the not unimportant names, could only have been devised by himself and his friends in Athens, as is admitted even by the pious Herodotus (5, 66 ἐξευρών). The sanction of Delphi assumed the form of a command ; this is true not only of this particular case, but as a universal rule.

11. The fact that the Delphic oracle assisted barbarians as well as Hellenes, shows that as a bond of union for the Greeks it was not on a level with Olympia, to which a barbarian could not be admitted as a competitor. This point must not be left out of consideration in our criticism of the Delphic oracle.

12. Curtius, G. G. I.[4] 472, says that "through Apollo the female sex became honoured as being the instrument of his will."

We hold that even without Apollo, Penelope, Andromache and Nausicaa have a higher position than most of the Greek women of the period subsequent to the Dorian migration, in which Apollo's influence was at its highest, and that in the case of Cassandra at all events the legend does not justify the words quoted.

13. E. Curtius (I. 464) has noted but not refuted the two objections raised by us. He states that the priests of the oracle demanded a confession of crime from the persons who applied to them, but the passages quoted by him refer to the Samothracian mysteries, a very different matter. Curtius (from p. 464) discusses the influence of Delphi in many directions. Having regard especially to his summary referred to lower down it seems appropriate to elucidate each point briefly. On p. 473 he says of Apollo, "the Greek months were fixed by his oracle." It would perhaps be more correct to say that the discrepancies between the solar year and the lunar months in Greece were often corrected in accordance with Delphic decisions. According to p. 483, road-making is of Delphic origin. On p. 49 he had said that the Phoenicians "broke the force of the devastating mountain-torrent; built dams and made the first roads" in Greece; on p. 484, on the other hand, he states: "the art of building roads and bridges, which made the wild mountain-torrents harmless, emanated from the national sanctuaries, especially those of Apollo." But neither the one nor the other seems to us proved. According to Corp. Ins. Gr. I. 1688, it certainly was the duty of the Amphictyons to take charge of certain roads and bridges, probably those leading to Delphi; that, however, does not prove his assertion, nor is there any proof in Curtius' statement that the visitors to the festival, and especially the competitors in the chariot-race, required carriage roads. In the first place, carriage roads were just as necessary for the ordinary traffic, and, secondly, there were no chariot-races at Delphi until the sixth century. Hence the influence of Delphi on road-making throughout Greece is not proved. Its influence on colonization, in which province Curtius attributes to the oracle a wise guidance and a superior intelligence, and sees "perhaps the greatest and most enduring service rendered by the Delphic oracle," we have already attempted to disprove. Trade-fairs accompanied the festal assemblies; hence, according to Curtius, "besides the Milesian and Delphian sanctuaries, the Delian Temple, the Heraeum at Samos, and the Artemisium at Ephesus became the 'Ausgangspunkte' of a great maritime commerce" (p. 487). We are quite clear that the impulse to commerce of this kind did not come from religion, and we think that the

expression "Ausgangspunkt" does not exactly convey the proper idea. The churches of St. Mark at Venice, of St. George at Genoa, and of St. John in Florence are not considered the "Ausgangspunkte" of the commerce of the Venetians, the Genoese, and the Florentines, and yet the Venetians were as certain to build a San Marco wherever they settled, as the Chalcidians were to erect a temple to Apollo. The fact that the Genoese called their bank Banco di S. Giorgio, and the Neapolitans called theirs Banco di S. Giacomo, does not prove that their commerce was the result of religious impulse. At Naples the church of S. Spirito founded a bank when its revenues became very large. It wished to benefit itself as well as the public. But interest calculations are easier to make than maritime expeditions. Even the Jesuits were not able to conduct the latter for any length of time. Hence in regard to maritime commerce also, the position maintained above is in our opinion the correct one: the priests of Apollo did not take the lead. After the foregoing we have no objections to make to Curtius' remarks (p. 488) on the temples as banking institutions. He discusses the use of writing at p. 493; that this originated from the temples for public purposes is evident; but Delphi was not more prominent in this respect than other sacred places. Delphi's "historical composition," as Curtius himself explains, was confined to a deliberate garbling of history. The doctrine of immortality (p. 498) is supposed to be connected with Delphi. But no proof is forthcoming that it appeared there earlier than elsewhere; Polygnotus' picture is not earlier than the fifth century. According to Curtius the Delphic oracle "gathered round it an intellectual aristocracy" in the Seven Sages. Their sayings inscribed on the temple constitute the wisdom of Delphi. We hold that the Seven Sages, if they were the authors of these sayings, owed them to their own reflection, and were not inspired by the Pythia, but by the whole tendency of the age. On p. 502 Curtius says: "Like Lycurgus, so did Pythagoras, as his name shows, derive his wisdom from the Pythia, and the Delphic priestess, who is said to have transmitted to him the doctrines which he propagated, is called Themistoclea." We can only say that, in spite of Herod. 1, 65, we do not believe that Lycurgus received the substance of his legislation from the Pythia; that, like most modern writers, we consider the statement regarding Themistoclea to be a fable, and that we do not see how the name which Pythagoras bore before he could have become acquainted with Themistoclea (or had he a different name before this?) can signify that he learned anything from her. According to p. 507 the

Doric style of architecture is said to be connected with Delphi; but no proof is given. On the contrary, there are many elements in it which show connection with Corinth. The "sacerdotal order that in the Dorian state the doors and roofs of private houses were to be fashioned with axe and saw," is handed down only for Sparta as a part of the legislation of Lycurgus. The remarks on p. 507, that "the development and extension of the Doric style of architecture are certainly connected with the same sanctuary which laid the foundations of the Dorian states," do not, in our opinion, prove anything of the kind. It was natural enough that priests should sketch the arrangement of temples, but it does not follow that the priests of Delphi superintended the architecture of all temples generally. On p. 527 the ideas expressed by Hesiod are called "nothing but thoughts of the Delphic priesthood." It is difficult to say what the thoughts of the Delphic priesthood were, if we leave out of account the well-known sayings, which are of later date, and (which is not without importance) were not the result of the initiative of the priests but of that of the Amphictyones. On p. 538 Curtius gives a summary of his views to the effect that from the ninth century all progress in Greece "in every department of intellectual life, in religious and moral speculation, in politics, in architecture and sculpture, in music and poetry, was really due to the influence of Delphi." We have already expressed our view to the contrary. According to Curtius (p. 539) a complete change took place in the time of Cleisthenes of Sicyon, when Delphi "adopted a wily opportunist policy." But Cleisthenes belongs to the beginning of the sixth century, the very period at which the records of the Delphic oracle cease to be purely legendary. For this was the time when Delphi gathered the "intellectual aristocracy" round it. Was that, too, merely the outcome of a wily opportunist policy? It is, therefore, more correct to abandon this assumed influence of Delphi, and to judge it by what it really did accomplish, and that is what is stated in our text. And is not our view more consistent with a real appreciation of the Greeks, that their great deeds always proceeded from the minds of the best representatives of the nation in its various branches, than that which ascribes every great achievement for a space of two hundred years to a college of priests, who are supposed to be always dictating to and prompting the rest of the nation? The world had more variety than this even in the Middle Ages. We, therefore, do not deny the authority of the Delphic oracle, but only the preponderance of intelligence and initiative on the part of its priests. We have considered this brief criticism necessary, because the passage

quoted from p. 538 of a much esteemed and widely circulated book would, if correct, amount to a condemnation of our own point of view.

14. Schömann (2, 44) declines to condemn the oracle outright, because the superiority of the Persians was too overwhelming, and because afterwards, when the luck began to turn, it defended the national cause. But this only proves the cunning of the priests, and does not excuse them from a moral point of view. The unfounded panegyrics of the Delphic oracle have made people so blind to its faults that even well-written books now speak of its decided advocacy of the national cause in the Persian wars, while the reverse was the case. Hence it seemed to us all the more desirable to emphasize the opposite view. And here we may lay stress on a point of considerable importance. The modern theory, of which Göttling is a prominent exponent (who even insists upon the profundity and good sense of the oracle about the tortoise and the sheep's flesh delivered to Croesus), makes the priests really greater impostors than the older view does, because it represents them as men of considerable knowledge. If everything is the result of geographical and statistical knowledge on the part of the priests, it is clearly a delusion to attribute it to the god. If the priests, acting upon hints conveyed by the questioners, converted unintelligible sounds given forth by the Pythia into oracular utterances, they could in most cases perfectly well consider themselves as *bona fide* mouthpieces of the god. There being nothing to prove their supposed extraordinary knowledge, it is better not to lower their moral character by assuming the existence of it.

15. For the value of the *Panegyris*, cf. the fine passage Isocr. Paneg. 43 seq. Olympia has been laid bare by the German excavations of 1875-81, which were started in consequence of the impulse given by E. Curtius. Information concerning the work itself and the discoveries made is for the present given by the official publication, which is well supplied with photographs, "Die Ausgrabungen zu Olympia," 5 vols. The following is a precursor of a systematically-arranged work: Olympia und Umgegend, with maps by Kaupert and Dörpfeld, edited by Curtius and Adler, Berl. 1882. Cf. the series of reports in the Archaeological Journal and popular descriptions, Olympia, das Fest und seine Stätte, by Ad. Bötticher, Berl. 1883, with many illustrations, as well as the excellent summary by Baedeker. We cannot give any quotations here to illustrate the endless series of problems raised or solved by these excavations.

16. The ambition of the tyrants evidently did much to enhance the splendour of the treasure-houses.

17. For the Pythian Games, Strab. 9, 421 ; Paus. 10, 7, 4 seq. ; Schöm. 2, 65 seq.

18. For the Nemean Games, Strab. 8, 377 ; Paus. 2, 15 ; Schöm. 2, 67.

19. For the Isthmian Games, Paus. 1, 44, 11 ; 2, 1, 3 ; Plut. Thes. 25, where we should not interpret the *προεδρία* of the Athenians as meaning that they ranked before every one else. Every deputation to the festival had the honour of the Proedria ; the word does not imply that one had an advantage over the others. For the date of the reorganization, see Duncker, 6, 57, and Schöm. 2, 68.

CHAPTER XX

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREEK STATES: MONARCHY, ARISTOCRACY, LEGISLATORS, TYRANTS

In the preceding chapter we have enumerated the various forms in which the concert of all the Greeks found expression, and have specified the elements which promoted their intellectual unity. We have seen that these bonds of union were recognized only of their own free will. The Greeks had no desire to form a single state which would have included all the rest. The state was only known to the Greeks under the form of an area having for its centre a fortified city, in which all the citizens either lived or at all events could find enough room to take refuge in case of a hostile attack. The Greek state was a more or less developed community.[1] It might however happen that several communities would feel so intimately associated with one another that they considered themselves under the obligation of mutual protection, and this was generally the case when a tribe had conquered a considerable extent of territory, and then planted communities of its own people at the principal points of the country thus acquired, each of these communities continuing to recognize its connection with the others, and all of them moreover being in need of mutual protection. This was the case, according to historical tradition, with Boeotia, where the conquering race retained its unity even in later times. But it was also the case in districts as to which it is not known when and how

they were conquered, such as Aetolia, Phocis, and elsewhere. As a rule the tie which bound them was of a very loose description, and it would be useless to endeavour to discover the laws and statutes which controlled their internal association and regulated their public acts. This comes from the conditions of life in those times, which had no written laws.[2] Hence in Greece state and city are one, and both are designated by the word "Polis." "Polis" then is the state, *i.e.* the sum total of the citizens, and also the fortified wall-girt city, which formed at once the centre and the protection of the state. But it was necessary for a state to be able to stand on its own resources. If it required external aid to enable its citizens to live, it was no longer independent. Owing to the simple wants of that age, this condition was satisfied by its having sufficient land to supply the citizens with bread and meat. The states were therefore of small extent. As a rule the citizens took up their abode near the land which they cultivated; but they would also prefer not to be quite isolated, so as to have assistance at hand to repel the ordinary attacks of robbers, and to meet any destructive outbreaks of nature. Thus we get besides the Polis small rural centres in the state, the "Komae" or villages. It might also happen that the capital, which had to be called Polis, was not a fortified place, but only an agglomeration of neighbouring Komae. In that case it was said of the city that it consisted of villages—built *κατὰ κώμας*—as was the case with Sparta. It might even happen that there were nothing but Komae in a district, places more or less inhabited after the fashion of a village, each fortified more by nature than by art, and without any permanent political centre, which could be called a really walled city, or even a city consisting of a group of Komae. In a case of this kind public affairs were discussed at any suitable spot that might be selected, and according to the Greek mode of expression the whole country was then said to be inhabited *κατὰ κώμας*. This would be the case with a nation not very far

advanced in civilization, as, for instance, in part of Arcadia and in Acarnania. Nevertheless some of these Komae, those which were stronger and more easily defended than the rest, might be designated as Poleis. If the above definitions should convey the impression that instead of throwing light on the subject we are only making it more obscure, it must be remembered that life is not regulated by scientific ideas, which, on the contrary, may be so far from correctly representing the reality in all its varied aspects that the same expression may be used for two perfectly different sets of facts. It is only too easy to attach more importance to technical expressions than they really deserve.[3]

It is natural to conjecture that just as the Greeks saw their national unity expressed in a common religion and in similar manners and customs, they would also recognize certain forms of dealing with public affairs as specially Greek, in other words, that there must have existed something in the nature of a constitution corresponding to the Greek character. But here again we must be careful not to lay stress on formulas, or attach too much importance to mere words. Just as a Greek pictured to himself a city only as an association of individuals, in which it was materially possible for each citizen to take part in public affairs—and this implied a district of moderate extent—so his idea of a proper constitution was limited to that in which such a participation was legally within the reach of every citizen. Both ideas are intimately connected. If in a state of great extent the absolute supremacy of one individual is easily explained by the fact that public affairs, involving, for instance, the security of the state, cannot be properly managed by all the citizens, who are debarred from obtaining a comprehensive view of important matters, on the other hand, such a form of government in states of the size of the Greek would be equally superfluous and pernicious.[4] Consequently it was the rule in Greece that every citizen was allowed to express his opinion on public affairs.[5] This was

consistent with the adoption of very different forms of government. Antiquity devoted much attention to theories of these forms, and to this fact, and especially to the great Aristotle, we owe the present scientific division of constitutions into monarchies or kingships, aristocracies and democracies. The scientific value of this division, as well as the definition of the three terms, need not be further discussed in this place; but it is certain that the conceptions of monarchy or kingship, of aristocracy and democracy, have no real independent existence, and that the ancients were not agreed as to the definitions of them.[6] Greek life, however, was compatible with each of these three forms. Moreover, in all the Greek states, with a few more apparent than real exceptions, the development of the constitution was the same; monarchy, which was the original form, led to aristocracy, and this to democracy. The most prominent exception to the rule was Sparta, which retained her monarchy up to the last period of her existence as an important state. But Sparta occupied an altogether exceptional position in Greece, and for that very reason we have thought best to deal with her history separately; besides, the Spartan monarchy was itself of a peculiar nature.[7]

Let us first trace the history of kingly rule in the Greek states. In Argos, as we have seen, Temenus was the first Heraclid king. The last of this dynasty was Meltas, whose date cannot be precisely determined; then another family came to the throne, and finally the royal dignity became an empty name. In Corinth the descendants of Aletes ruled up to the middle of the eighth century, when an aristocracy was introduced. In Elis the son of Oxylus was still king. In the district of Pisatis we find a king named Pantaleon at the time of the second Messenian war. Arcadia was said to have been governed by kings in the earliest times, who are supposed to have ruled over the whole country. During the second Messenian war Aristocrates appears as king of Orchomenus; he betrayed the Messenians, and was in consequence

killed. In Athens monarchy is said to have been abolished after the death of Codrus. In Thebes no more kings can be discovered after the legendary Xanthus. In northern Greece Epirus showed herself true to old traditions by long retaining a genuine monarchy in the family of the Aeacidae. Thessaly, on the other hand, bound up more closely with Greece and her progress, oscillated between monarchy and aristocracy; the latter predominates, but the kingly title was not forbidden in individual cities. In Macedonia the monarchy of the Heraclidae was retained. In Asia we find as kings among the Aeolians the descendants of Penthilus of the family of Orestes, while in the Ionian colonies the Neleidae were at first undoubtedly kings. The oligarchy of the Basilidae in Erythrae evidently derived its name from the fact that its members were of royal descent. Kings are also mentioned in Samos and Chios. In the Dorian colonies we find kings in Ialysus and Halicarnassus; there were kings also in Thera, and Cyrene in north Africa, which was founded by Thera in the seventh century, had kings for a long time, of whom history has much to tell and of a character that is not always favourable, their rule partaking of the nature of an Oriental despotism.[8] There is little to be said of the western colonies. Mention is made of a king of Tarentum as late as the time of Darius Hystaspes. If, especially in Sicily, usurpers or voluntarily-recognized rulers were styled kings, they were something quite different to the old monarchies. These colonies were founded at a time when monarchy was disappearing in Greece itself.

What then was the reason of the gradual abolition of monarchy? We must distinguish the internal from the external causes, which latter are specially emphasized by the ancients. Their account is that monarchy degenerated into tyranny, and that the kings indulged in a life of luxury or in acts of violence.[9] This may have been the impulse in many cases, but the real causes lay deeper. The old Greek

monarchy was the position of *primus inter pares;* so long as the king was satisfied with it all went on satisfactorily. But it sometimes happened that he would not confine himself to the part he had to play. In that case it was not necessary that he should be cruel or vicious, it was sufficient that he should wish to have the sole command, to make the nobles combine to assert their rights, and prefer to abolish the office of king for their own safety.[10] We shall see in the history of Athens that there were periods of transition in which it is hard to say whether monarchy or aristocracy was the real form of constitution.

It is a matter of indifference whether we give this second form of constitution, which for centuries governed the Greek cities, the name of aristocracy or oligarchy; at any rate it was not oligarchy in a bad sense. It was natural that the nobles, who after the abolition of the monarchy had the supreme power in their own hands, should make regulations of a special kind concerning public procedure, the want of which had been one of the causes of the revolution. The abolition of the monarchy led to a more constitutional state of affairs. But we are unable to enter into the details of the new constitutions. We might enumerate the places in which, according to the accounts of the ancients, aristocracies existed, but these are only fragmentary records, which for the most part say nothing of their origin or of their duration. We must therefore content ourselves with general observations, referring for details to the history of Athens, the only one that is better known.

In an aristocracy power was concentrated in the hands of members of distinguished families, who may also be styled nobles. Nobility rested on the possession of landed property which had been held from a comparatively remote period. The tracing of the descent of noble families from heroes or gods, with a collective name for the whole family, was of common occurrence in Greece. At the same time it is

worthy of note that the names by which the families were known referred as a rule not directly to the famous heroes in question, but to other later individuals. Thus in Mitylene we find the Penthilidae, who represented their ancestor Penthilus as a son of Orestes, and might therefore have called themselves Tantalidae. The Bacchiadae in Corinth maintained that Bacchis was descended from Heracles, and yet were not called Heraclidae. Alcibiades belonged to the race of the Eurysacidae; but as Eurysaces was sprung from Aeacus, they might have called themselves Aeacidae, which would have sounded more aristocratic. The kings of Sparta were called Agiadae and Eurypontidae. They were subsequently connected with Heracles by means of Eurysthenes and Procles. The occurrence of family names usually referring to some comparatively unknown man proves that the more famous heroes, who were afterwards placed at the top of the pedigree, found their way into the genealogies only through the notorious ambition of noble houses.

Aristotle says[11] that after the abolition of the monarchy the Knights were at first at the head of the state, because at that time military power rested mainly on cavalry. This is probably correct in many cases, but not in all, for all districts were not suitable for horse-breeding, and even where the flatness of the country favoured it there was not always the desire to make cavalry the chief military arm. The Dorians as a rule gave the preference to infantry, and when Greece was in her prime the main strength of her armies lay in the heavy-armed troops. Yet in many districts the title Riders or Knights—Hippeis—denoted a privileged class of citizens. They were called Eupatridae as men of good family. Other expressions have come down from the people, *e.g.* the fat ones. At the time when their authority was contested they gave themselves names of honour, which their opponents would not concede to them, such as the best (hence aristocracy), the beautiful and good, the respectable, the notable (Gnorimoi,

corresponding to the Latin *nobiles*). There is no doubt that the heads of the noble families formed the deliberative body, and that the executive officers were appointed by them.

The division of the people is the same throughout the whole of Greek history; everywhere they were divided into Phylae or tribes, and these again into Phratriae or clans. The latter include the families, the original units for religious and legal purposes. In many states we know the names of the Phylae or the number of Phylae contained in it. The three Phylae of the Hyllees, Dymanes, and Pamphyles seem to have been peculiar to the Dorians, but more occur in some Dorian states. In Corinth eight are mentioned, which are supposed to be of a local character. And here we touch on a question which is difficult to decide. Which of the Phylae known to us are of purely local character? The difficulty is just as pronounced in the history of Attica, of which we have the most records, as in that of the other Greek states. And in what connection the division into Phylae stands to the aristocratic principle cannot in general be determined. It may be that all Phylae had equal rights, or that some had more privileges than others, or that different grades of privilege existed in the Phylae themselves. Upon this point even Athenian history throws no light.

Although aristocracy consisted in the rule of a group of members of prominent families, small in proportion to the body of the people, yet the principles which governed the claim of a particular family to be reckoned among the ruling ones were very elastic. The main requisites were the antiquity of the family and the possession of landed property. But mere wealth in landed property also gave consideration, and sooner or later, by the help of easily-invented genealogical fictions, parvenu families were bound to acquire the privileges which originally belonged only to the old ones. In this manner the claims of the rich to participation in all public affairs became more pressing, and here and there the original aristocracy

might develop into a Timocracy, or rule of the wealthy classes. But by this means an element of decay was introduced into the aristocracy. For wealth, especially when based upon commerce, does not always pass to descendants, and then the continuous transmission of property, which is the essential condition of the authority of an aristocracy, disappears. Thus aristocracy in time came to an end of itself, and was bound to collapse at the first powerful blow. When we have to account for its fall we must take care to distinguish internal from external causes. Among the latter stress is rightly laid on the notorious arrogance of the aristocrats, who took their own will for law and rode roughshod over the rights and feelings of the other citizens. It was said of the Penthilidae in Mitylene, that they went about armed with clubs and knocked down people they did not like on the open highway.[12] Feuds among the aristocrats themselves naturally contributed to the rise of their opponents. And lastly, a general weakening of the whole aristocracy by the wars in which many of its members perished, hastened the downfall of government by the classes. But the above are merely the handles of which the enemies of the aristocrats availed themselves. The real cause of their fall is to be found in the fact that citizens excluded from participation in public affairs will not put up with it in the long run, especially if they are gradually becoming the equals of the others in property and education. And this is perfectly natural. Aristocracy—interpreted in the sense that only a few have political rights—is only justifiable in cases where marked differences of wealth and refinement exist; equality of education implies equality of privilege. The struggle of the less privileged to remove their political disabilities is therefore very natural; every aristocracy carries in it the germ of dissolution, when education is continuously progressive, as was the case in Greece.

When monarchy and aristocracy are worn out, democracy

has its turn. But an aristocracy offers more resistance than a single dynasty; it does not yield without a struggle, and this struggle does not always have the same issue. A decisive victory of the nobles, ensuring the continuance of the *status quo*, is of extremely rare occurrence. It would imply an arrest of the development of the state, which was seldom likely to happen in the Greece of that time. But absolute success on the part of the people, followed by a simple transformation of the aristocracy into a democracy, is equally rare. As a rule, the times were not ripe for this in the period preceding the Persian wars. The outcome of the struggle usually is that satisfaction is given to the discontented party, without any fundamental change being made in the constitution. This was generally effected in one of the three following ways :—internal reform by means of a legislature, the advent to power of a tyrant, and the founding of colonies.

When quarrels broke out between the privileged classes and those who considered themselves justified in demanding complete or partial equality of rights, or merely the removal of abuses, it was usual to refer them to the arbitration of men whose character and wisdom stood in high repute. It was characteristic of the Greeks as well as of the circumstances of the age, which was accustomed to bow before the moral weight of personal ascendency, firstly, that the framing of laws was entrusted not to a number of people but to one person, and secondly, that his proposals were accepted as a matter of course. Unfortunately the details of legislation of this kind are little known. In many cases we cannot say whether the changes amount to a regular constitution, or only to a few regulations, although the distinction is one of more importance in theory than in practice. The first legislator is said to have been Lycurgus, whom we have already discussed; the most important was Solon, whom we shall notice presently. But there were some before the time of Solon, such as Zaleucus of Locris, and Charondas of Catana. Philolaus of Corinth gave

laws to Thebes, and Demonax of Mantinea did the like for Cyrene.[13] Pittacus of Mitylene, who was styled Aesymnetes, was a contemporary of Solon. This title was given to men who were entrusted by their fellow-citizens with supreme power in times of civil discord, either for life or for a definite term.[14] For that period they were absolute rulers of the state. Their future action depended upon circumstances and their own discretion, but in any event during their term of office they held a position similar to that of the Roman dictators. Thus the Aesymnetes formed the connecting link between the law-giver and the tyrant; he was recognized as a law-giver by the citizens, and ruled absolutely like a tyrant.

The tyrants[15] are one of the most peculiar phenomena of Greek political life. The name has not yet been satisfactorily explained. It first occurs, so far as we know, in the poet Archilochus at the beginning of the seventh century, and it is supposed to have been taken from one of the dialects of Asia Minor. Tyrants, according to the definition of Aristotle, were rulers who exercised their power, not for the benefit of the public, but in their own personal interest, and gave no account of their actions. The definition is vague, but it meets the requirements of the case. All constitutional authority is subject to some sort of control; this is the responsibility of which Aristotle speaks; the man who assumes supreme power in contravention of the constitution, or who abuses constitutional power for his own interests, becomes a tyrant. Hence it comes that we can give the name of tyrant in the ancient sense of the word to rulers who have succeeded to the throne in due course of law, but who govern arbitrarily. Generally speaking, however, the expression tyrant is confined to the man who makes himself dictator in a state which has hitherto been governed by the will of the citizens. So far as our records go, the first tyrant in Greece appears about the beginning of the seventh century. They obtained their power as representatives of the oppressed lower stratum of the people

against the aristocracy. What the people wanted was not so much a share in the government, as the abolition of arbitrary power, justice, but not rights. If the nobles persisted in their arrogance, the people resorted to force as a remedy, and for this purpose a leader was necessary. If this leader was an ambitious man he would use the opportunity to usurp unlimited power, and in this way tyranny would proceed from the agitation of a discontented people. A tyranny once established could be maintained for a time by the ability of the holder; but it never became a legitimate authority. For the nobles clung to their rights, while the lower classes looked on the tyrant merely as means of obtaining freedom from oppression. If the recollection of the lawless rule of the nobles faded away in course of time, then the inevitable despotism of the tyrants became more intolerable, and brought about a wish for deliverance from them also; and then, if the enemies of the despot succeeded in effecting a junction of the permanent discontent of the nobility and the newly-aroused discontent of the popular leaders, the fall of the tyrant became merely a question of time Sometimes the founder of a tyranny maintained his position during his lifetime, and the tyranny lasted till the second or third generation. The son and successor of the first ruler, if he had grown up as hereditary prince, was as a rule unable to govern with the care which alone could secure the continuance of the tyranny. And even if the son managed to hold out, the grandson was sure to fall. There is no case of a tyranny lasting for more than a century in Greece.

Tyrants who had not inherited their power, but had founded it themselves, were at all events energetic men, and they generally combined with their energy a correct appreciation of the civilizing tendencies of the age, of the paths which should be followed by commerce, of the advantages to be derived from intercourse with foreign countries, and of the benefits to be gained by the promotion of art and science.

Each fresh success which they achieved for their city redounded to their honour as well as to that of the city, and thus created for them a new element of security. Hence the prestige, which occasionally the first, but more often the second of the line, managed to give to his court and at the same time to his city, of which we see examples in Corinth, Athens, and Syracuse. But however fair the outward semblance with which the tyrants adorned their government, the basis of their rule was always force, and the moral character of the people always suffered under them. Religious and political reformers were always opponents of the Tyrannis. The earliest tyrant in Greece was, it is said, Andreas or Orthagoras in Sicyon, at the beginning of the seventh century. We shall refer later on to his family and to the tyrants of Corinth, the Cypselidae, as well as to Theagenes of Megara, the Pisistratidae, Polycrates, Lygdamis of Naxos, and Thrasybulus of Miletus. We also find tyrants in Phlius, in Crisa, in Chalcis, and elsewhere in eastern Hellas. Tyrants appeared quite early in the cities of Italy and Sicily; these will be discussed in their proper place.

The third course of action, involving a temporary settlement of the quarrels between an aristocracy and an aspiring people, consisted in founding colonies. A member of the less privileged classes in his own city became, if he participated in the settlement of a colony, one of the landed proprietors and aristocrats in the new city. The parent city thus got rid of discontented elements, and the aristocracy which was the object of attack might prolong its existence for decades and even for centuries if it made a skilful use of colonization.

We have now to follow the history of Greece as it appears under the influence of the above-mentioned factors, the aristocracy, the legislator, the tyrant, and the aspiring people. It is the history of those Greek states which are marked by change and by a progressive civilization. We shall see that Sparta has but little connection with it.

NOTES

1. Cf. a work with a wide and profound grasp of the subject, Fustel de Coulanges, La cité antique, Par., Hachette, 9th edition, which groups the various facts in the light of an ingenious theory, and Fowler's book quoted above, which is the best work on this subject, and is conceived in a truly philosophical spirit. For details see also Gilbert, St. Alt. II.

2. On Leagues cf. Schömann, Gr. Alt. 2, 76 seq., and W. Vischer, on the formation of states and leagues or centralization and federation in ancient Greece, in his Kleine Schriften, Bd. I. Lpz. 1877. Instances of confederations without a capital were those of the Phocians, Locrians, Acarnanians, Aetolians and Achaeans. Thessaly presented a more artificial organization. Boeotia had a fortified outpost in Thebes.

3. On these questions cf. the work of E. Kuhn, Ueber die Entstehung der Städte der Alten, Lpz. 1878, which has a too marked tendency towards systematization. It has hitherto not been sufficiently noticed that κατὰ κώμας has two quite distinct meanings, according as a whole race or a single city is in question. A population lives κατὰ κώμας if it has no fortified town as a political centre ; but separate Komai may perfectly well have their own fortifications, and there is no objection to calling them πόλεις in consequence. Cf. Thuc. 3, 94, and 3, 97. In another sense Thuc. 1, 10 specifies the city of Sparta as inhabited κατὰ κώμας, because the groups of houses were not surrounded by fortifications ; thus Strab. 14, 646, describes Smyrna in the same manner as long as it had no walls. According to Herod. 1, 170, the Ionian towns were mere Demoi, when they only had one common βουλευτήριον. We assert that the expressions κῶμαι (Ionic δῆμοι) and πόλεις were used by the Greeks themselves in an elastic way, so that a place may be in one sense a κώμη, in another a πόλις. Another example of this elasticity is the title βασιλεύς, which in Greece connoted widely different ideas. Familiarity with Roman institutions makes us give this title too precise a meaning.

4. This is the reason why monarchy was able to maintain itself in Epirus and Macedonia. Nations which combined a consciousness of internal unity with a low standard of civilization, a small urban population, and a large extent of territory were suited to a hereditary monarchy.

5. It does not, however, follow from this in the case of Greeks that the legally-constituted community, even if organized on a

democratic basis, possessed the legislative power as a matter of course. Our modern ideas in this respect are derived from Roman institutions, which were quite different from Greek. This point has not been sufficiently emphasized in Greek histories. The liberty of speech, which was so dear to the Greeks, the *ἰσηγορίη*, was hostile to tyranny, not to an aristocracy (Herod. 5, 78).

6. We need only recall the fact that Theseus was regarded as the author of the Athenian democracy. And yet it is as clear as it can be that in those ages there was no idea of what was afterwards called democracy. When people spoke of the democracy of Theseus, they understood by the word Demos the aggregate of enfranchised persons, which at that time was really an aristocracy. Cf. Plut. Thes. 25, where the democracy of Theseus is spoken of as not a pure democracy, *i.e.* as an aristocracy. In Her. 6, 131, Cleisthenes is the *τὴν δημοκρατίαν καταστήσας*. And yet he only introduced new divisions into the Demos, and did not give it any new rights.

7. The best introduction to the study of Greek constitutional systems from the point of view of their theoretical significance is supplied by the Politics of Aristotle ; it is much to be regretted that his *πολιτεῖαι*, an account of the constitutions of the various Greek and non-Greek cities, is lost. The fragments are collected in Müller II. A detailed description of the changes of the various constitutions in Greece is given in the works of Hermann and Schömann on Greek Staatsalterthümer. The Aristotelian accounts of the character of the various constitutions still exert a general influence on modern ideas. A good criticism of the forms of government is to be found in Schäffle's Encyklopädie der Staatslehre, Tüb. 1878, pp. 273-326. For the appearance of the monarchy in various Greek states, cf. esp. Schömann I. and Gilbert II. A king in Argos about 480, Herod. 7, 149. For Arcadia, cf. Busolt, Die Lakedämonier I. The kings in Hes., Op. et D. 38, are simply the elders of the people. Kings in Opus Pind. Ol. 9, 56. The Basileus at Delphi in Plut. Qu. Gr. 12, is a priest. Kings in Thessaly, Pind. Pyth. 10, 4 ; Herod. 7, 6. Kings in Ionian cities, Parth. narr. 14 ; Con. narr. 44. Hippocles in Chios, Plut. mul. virt. 3. In Tarentum, Herod. 3, 136.

8. The passage in Herod. 4, 161, 162, is instructive, where the Mantinean Demonax in his reform of the constitution allows Battus only *τεμένεα* and *ἱεροσύνας*, and then Archesilaus demands *τὰ τῶν προγόνων γέρεα*.

9. Immediate cause of the abolition of monarchy, Polyb. 6, 4, 8, and 7, 6-9 ; Plat. Legg. 3, 690 ; Ar. Pol. 5, 8, 22, 23.

10. In the family the authority of the father has a religious basis. Where the community developed into a clan, a race, and

finally into a πόλις, the authority of the chief magistrate is derived from free recognition of it by the heads of families and clans. Conquest no doubt led to despotism.—On the possibility of the rise of an aristocracy from a community composed of equals and kinsmen, see the interesting account of Braun-Wiesb. on Croatia in the Allg. Z., Oct. '85, which perhaps might be of use for the study of Greek history.

11. The Knights were the first noble rulers, Ar. Pol. 4, 10, 9.

12. Arrogance of the Penthilidae, Ar. Pol. 5, 8, 13.

13. Foreigners were more impartial than natives. Legislation by the people themselves was regarded by the Greeks as particularly liable to partiality, and therefore to be avoided. So in Italy there are foreign Podestà, *e.g.* Catalano and Loderingo in Florence, Dante, Inferno XXII.

14. For the Aesymnetae, Hermann, St. A. § 63; Plass, Tyrannis, I. 115. In some places the Aesymnetae were permanent officials.

15. Plass, Die Tyrannis in ihren beiden Perioden bei den Alten Griechen, 2 Bde., Bremen 1852, a very useful work, which in its description of the Tyrannis has taken a wrong line only on one point, viz. that, developing certain statements of the ancients, it seeks to establish a fundamental internal distinction between the tyranny of earlier and later times, conceiving the former to be a phenomenon arising out of the disturbances characterizing the transition period between aristocracy and democracy, and so in a certain sense necessary, and the latter as based on brute force, and as it were more or less fortuitous in character. But with the older tyrants like Phalaris, Pisistratus, and Polycrates, brute force is as indispensable an instrument as with the later ones, while the most important of the latter, like Dionysius and Agathocles, owed their rise quite as much as the former to the hatred which the lower classes bore to the nobles. The times only had changed, and education had become more diffused; the origin and nature of the tyrannis remained the same throughout. For the definition of tyrant, see Ar. Pol. 4, 8, 3. We must further call attention to a fact which is perhaps sometimes lost sight of, that Herodotus makes no real distinction between monarchy and tyranny; cf. 3, 80; 8, 137; 5, 44; even in the mouth of the Pythia, 5, 92. The word βασιλεύς always conveyed the idea of Greek, and τύραννος of non-Greek rule. Some writers called Gyges the first tyrant; Radet, La Lydie, 146.

CHAPTER XXI

GREEK COLONIZATION

THE first subject to be considered is colonization, that is to say, the gradual spread of the Greeks along the coasts of the Mediterranean.[1] It originated in the internal development of the Greek states which we discussed in the preceding chapter. It lasted for centuries, chiefly from the first half of the eighth to the middle of the sixth century B.C. The movement proceeded from a number of cities situated on the coasts and in the islands of the Aegean Sea.[2] We believe that we can discern two distinct currents, one flowing in the track of commerce, and another following the results of that commerce, that is, civilization generally. We saw that of the two standards of weights and coinage the Aeginetan came in all probability from Phoenicia, the Euboic on the other hand from Babylon across Asia Minor. This may point to the existence of a double trade-route, a southerly one through Phoenicia to the Dorian states of Greece, and a northerly one from Asia Minor across the Ionic Samos to the Ionic Euboea. But the two currents soon intermingled.

Before we discuss colonization itself, we must say a few words about the municipal organization of some of the colonizing cities. The Greek communities of Asia Minor, which is specially in question here, had a mixed population. According to Herodotus[3] some of the Ionian emigrants married Carian women, and some Ionian cities had princes of

Lycian extraction belonging to the family of Glaucus and Hippolochus. While Miletus, Teos, Perinthus and the Milesian colonies exhibit the same Ionic Phylae as Attica, we find elsewhere other divisions, and in Ephesus it has been expressly recorded [4] that the Ionian colonists entered into a treaty with some of the original inhabitants, so that when we come across other Phylae here, we may consider one of them to be that of the original inhabitants of the place, who grouped themselves round the temple of Artemis. The religious centre of the Ionians was the temple of Poseidon on Mycale, whose worship had been brought from the Peloponnese; but the most famous deities, Artemis of Ephesus, Apollo of Clarus near Colophon and the Samian Hera, were evidently native divinities hellenized. The religious bond between the Asiatic and European Ionians was the worship of Apollo at Delos, the small sunny island, to a certain extent sacred to the sun alone, which lay in the very centre of the Ionic world. Here Leto is said to have given birth to Apollo and Artemis; here Theseus with the youths and maidens rescued from Crete performed the first choral dance before the altar in honour of Apollo, and presented the best dancer with a branch of the sacred palm. The relations of the Delian god extended beyond Athens and Miletus as far as the Hyperboreans.

In politics the Ionian cities underwent the transitions described in the preceding chapter. Monarchy gave place to the rule of the nobles. We are in possession of details relating to this point in various cities, but they are in a fragmentary state and with no chronological basis. In Miletus [5] Epimenes was entrusted with the re-organization of the constitution. After that an elected Prytane was chief magistrate, unless tyrants usurped the government. Colophon [6] was celebrated for its equestrian nobility, the indomitable strength of which was proverbial. The city was governed by a council of 1000 men chosen from the propertied

classes. An equestrian nobility is also found in other Ionian cities.

Of particular events only the following can be related. In Miletus towards the close of the seventh century B.C. supreme power was in the hands of Thrasybulus,[7] a tyrant who had come from the ranks of the nobility, of whom it is related, that when his friend Periander sent to ask him how he should rule Corinth, he took the messenger into a field of corn, and knocked off the highest ears with his stick, and dismissed the messenger without saying a word. After the death of Thrasybulus confusion prevailed for a considerable time in Miletus, rich and poor confronting each other in bitter opposition. The factions are said to have taken the names Plutis (?) and Cheiromache, or Aeinautae and Gergithae. In consequence of the acts of cruelty perpetrated on both sides the sacred olive tree of Athens withered, and the oracle ordered the Milesians to do penance. They selected the community of Paros as arbitrator, and the Parian plenipotentiaries traversed the territory of the city and noted the owners of well-cultivated land: their award was that the latter should be placed at the head of the government, for they had known how to manage their own property well, and so would probably govern the city well too. Thus the quarrel between the merchants (Aeinautae) and the artizans was settled by neither class obtaining power, which was conferred on those landed proprietors who managed their own property. In this way Miletus entered on a fresh period of prosperity.

In Samos[8] too a serious rupture between the nobles and the people took place in the sixth century, which at one time led to a highly dramatic catastrophe. The Megarians were endeavouring to make themselves masters of Perinthus, which stood in the way of the Megarian Byzantium. The Geomori or ruling nobles of Samos sent thirty triremes to the assistance of the Perinthians. The Megarians were defeated and 600 of them taken prisoners. But the crews of the

Samian fleet consisted of democrats, whose leaders used the prisoners for a *coup d'état*. They gave them arms and led them into the Samian Assembly, and there the Megarians drew their swords and cut down the Geomori. Thus Samos remained for a long time under a democratic government, yet it appears to have been already superseded by an aristocracy at the time when Polycrates became tyrant.

The flower and strength of the Asiatic Aeolians were centred in Lesbos. Here also monarchy was abolished, but the Penthilidae maintained themselves at the head of affairs. The life of the aristocrats upon this island and their struggles with the people are known to us to a certain extent, chiefly through their poet Alcaeus and literary history. Attempts were made to establish a tyranny. In these disputes the figure of Pittacus of Mitylene comes into prominent relief; he was elected Aesymnetes by the people about 590 B.C. and behaved excellently. As legislator he limited himself to isolated ordinances, the most memorable being that which enacted that crimes committed under the influence of liquor should be punished more severely than those committed in a state of sobriety. After Pittacus had concluded peace between his city and Athens by the mediation of Periander, and recalled the exiles, he resigned office after about ten years of rule (about 570 B.C.), and died without being molested in the interval by his opponents, so universally was the uprightness of his character recognized. Pittacus was justly included among the seven wise men of Greece.[9]

Cyme was the most important of the Aeolic cities on the continent.[10] Here we find even in the eighth century a king Agamemnon, whose daughter became the wife of King Midas of Phrygia. The then ruling aristocracy was expanded into a timocracy. At the suggestion of a certain Pheidon all those who could perform military service with a charger received full civic rights. Prometheus introduced an enactment, according to which a committee of 1000 was placed at

the head of affairs. Thus matters remained until the time of the Persian wars.

The Dorian communities do not present incidents of importance.

Of the maritime states of Europe we shall discuss Megara and Corinth later. Athens will require a special description to itself; we shall only touch upon the cities of Euboea here. The fair and fertile Euboea had besides smaller towns two cities of great importance, Chalcis and Eretria, both on the straits which separate the island from the continent, Chalcis exactly at their narrowest part upon high ground, and Eretria a little to the southward in a plain. During the monarchical period mention is made of Amphidamas of Chalcis,[11] at whose burial games were celebrated, at which Hesiod carried off the prize. This incident was subsequently converted into a competition between Homer and Hesiod. Shortly afterwards we find an equestrian nobility[12] in Chalcis, the Hippobotae (horse-breeders), and a timocracy; no one could hold office until he had passed his fiftieth year. The power of Chalcis increased considerably owing to the successful issue of the long and tedious wars with its neighbouring rival. Eretria was densely populated, if it is true that it once celebrated a festal procession to its sacred temple of Artemis Amarynthia with 60 teams of horses, 600 knights, and 3000 hoplites. It possessed the greater part of southern Euboea with the exception of the Dryopian towns of Carystus and Styra, which were however on good terms with Eretria, while Chalcis ruled over the country in the north of the island. Behind both cities lay the fertile Lelantian plain, and it was over this fair territory that arose the struggle which Thucydides mentions because it developed into a war which implicated almost the whole of Hellas. All that we know is that the Thessalian cavalry, the Thracian colonies and the Samians assisted the Chalcidians, while the Milesians sided with the Eretrians. We shall subsequently

come across traces of groups of hostile Greek states which partly correspond with the above division. Eretria was at last conquered and the Lelantian plain belonged thenceforth to the Chalcidians.[13]

Greek colonization, to which we now turn our attention, differs from that of the Phoenicians and Romans. The Greek did not waste his energy in one-sided effort. He wished to be a free citizen of a state, to secure ample profit from his labour, and to enjoy life; in a word, he wanted scope for the full development of all his faculties. If this was denied him at home, he selected a band of companions, took ship, and settled in countries that appeared to offer him profit and security. The new settlement had to become an independent state as soon as possible; if there were men in sufficient numbers to protect themselves, that involved the wish to administer their own affairs. Thus the Greek colony is politically absolutely independent. It remains, however, all the more attached to the parent city by a sentiment of loyalty. This feeling found expression in religion. It was the custom to take fire from the hearth of the parent city, the Prytaneum, and to place it on the public hearth of the colony, where it always remained. The chief deities of the mother-country were transferred to the colony, which sent deputations to their principal festivals, and reserved places of honour for the citizens of the mother-country at the festivals celebrated in the colony. If the colony was embarrassed by internal dissensions, some person of high standing was sent for from the mother-country in order to restore order by his authority. Hostilities between a parent state and its colony seldom occurred, and then were due to exceptional circumstances. As a general rule, emigration softened the feelings of the exiles towards their native city, which had not always been a kind mother to them; only the memory of their common ties remained. But colonies were not always mere offshoots of one city. This we have seen in the case of the Ionian

cities; it was the same elsewhere; Dorians and Ionians often united to form a joint settlement. Sometimes bands of foreigners collected in some seaport town and took part in a colonizing expedition which started from thence. Moreover, in many places periodical attempts at colonization were made by small groups of Greek emigrants from different cities, which remained without importance, until a more imposing undertaking, often under the special sanction of the Delphic oracle, gave the settlement a definite character. Some of the Greeks who had settled there first would remain there, and in this way the colony would become of a mixed kind. Mixed populations arose in some colonies from the practice of not disturbing the aborigines; for a Greek colony was seldom planted on an entirely uninhabited spot. A motley crowd like this, composed of Greeks from various cities and the earlier barbarian inhabitants, could of course stand in no other relation to the nominal mother-country than that of respectful regard. Dependence on it was as a rule out of the question. Colonies were a source of renown, but never of strength, to the parent state; the flower of the nation departed; Athens always avoided colonization.

The Greek colonists always remained perfectly loyal to their nationality. It is true that both as regards religion and customs they adopted many peculiarities of their new home; but even in these respects they always remained Greek at heart. This was rendered easy from the very beginning by their religious connection not only with the mother-country but with the whole of Greece, which never failed to show itself in the keen interest which the colonists took in the great national festivals, especially in the Olympic Games.

Finally we must not omit to mention that many of the Greek settlements on foreign shores never became genuine republics. In many places the Greeks had to content themselves with forming a nucleus of Hellenic culture among barbarians, with considerable influence on the country and

people with whom they were brought in contact. This is true of the north of the Adriatic, of many parts of Spain, of Libya, and the south-east of Asia Minor. We may hope that more light will be thrown on Greek settlements of this kind.

Chalcis was perhaps the first to propagate Greek civilization by means of colonies. Ionia followed with great energy, and we will deal with her now, as we propose to take the eastern colonies first. But all the Ionian cities were not equally enthusiastic about voyages and distant settlements. Ephesus did little in this respect. On the other hand the most northerly and the most southerly of the Ionian cities, Phocaea and Miletus, achieved great importance by means of commerce, navigation and colonization, and may be compared with Genoa and Venice.[14]

The position of Miletus has been discussed above. Sheep-breeding was extensively carried on in the surrounding districts; the Milesians manufactured the wool and exported the stuffs. Thus agriculture, manufactures and commerce went hand in hand. In spite of the southerly position of the city the voyages of the Milesians were mostly directed northwards. They sailed through the Hellespont, the Propontis and the Bosporus into the Black Sea, a sea which has no Greek characteristics. In the Aegean we find promontories and islands everywhere; land is visible on all sides; the coasts are often rock-bound, but there are many safe harbours. The Black Sea extends farther than the eye can reach; it is stormy and destitute of islands, is bounded on the north by a flat, inhospitable coast, and leads finally to a second sea, into which a mighty river empties itself—thus opening up endless vistas to the north. All this was calculated to frighten the explorer. Yet this sea, called originally, as it is said, "axinus," or inhospitable, offered so much profit to a skilful merchant, that it soon received the name "euxinus," or hospitable. Many useful products were found on its shores. The Chalybes, Tibareni and Moschi on the south coast found

copper, silver and iron in the mountains and brought timber from the vast forests. The Scythians of the north coast sowed grain and reared cattle; the sea itself teemed with fish and furnished salt. The Milesians noted these advantages at an early date, and it was they who founded most of the colonies there. But other Ionian cities evidently co-operated with them, though individual cities may have been excluded by feelings of deep-seated jealousy.[15] The eighty or more colonies and factories ascribed to Miletus could not have been planted without the active co-operation of the rest of the Ionians.

The Milesians first visited the south coast of the Pontus, more hospitable and also more accessible by reason of the easterly current in those parts. As early as the eighth century they had planted the colony of Sinope on a promontory with two good harbours, and Sinope soon afterwards founded a new settlement farther east at Trapezus.[16] But to make the voyage to the Black Sea more secure, and in order to gain other points of vantage, they also founded colonies on the Hellespont and on the Propontis. Their neglect of these countries at first may have been due to a belief that the Aeolians had a prior claim to them. But the Aeolians were evidently content with the territory south of the promontory of Sigeium, and had no mind for a seafaring life. Thus the Milesians were able to found Abydos on the Hellespont and Cyzicus on the Propontis, upon a peninsula which was subsequently made into an island.[17] Cyzicus was famous chiefly for its productive tunny fisheries, and the inhabitants set so much store by them that they always stamped a tunny fish on their splendid coins. The Milesians also founded Parium on the Hellespont in conjunction with the Parians.

As soon as the southern shores of the Pontus, at the entrance of which the Greeks erected a temple to Zeus Urios, the sender of favourable winds, had been brought within the orbit of Greek commerce, the Milesians turned their attention

to its western and northern coasts.[18] About the middle of the seventh century they founded the city of Istros, south of the mouths of the Danube. The coast assumes a peculiar character above the delta of that river. A line of sandbanks extends along the estuary, and forms salt lagoons, like the "Haffs" of the Baltic, which are called Liman to this day, from the Greek Limé, or harbour. Many important Greek cities were gradually founded on this coast: Tyras on the Liman of the Dniester, Odessus on the Liman of the Teligul, and Olbia (Borysthenes) farther north, at a point where the Hypanis and the Borysthenes flow into the sea almost together (645 B.C.) They then penetrated farther eastwards. In the Taurian Chersonese (Crimea) was founded Theodosia and the important Panticapaeum, opposite which on the peninsula of Taman rose Phanagoria; the Kurgan (grave mounds) of native chieftains in the neighbourhood bear witness to the spread of Greek civilization. By means of Panticapaeum and Phanagoria the Greeks commanded the entrance to the Sea of Azov, the Maeotic Lake, where they planted the town of Tanais at the mouth of the Don, which in its turn became the parent city of Nauaris and Exopolis. On the shores of the Caucasian territory were the Greek settlements of Phasis and Dioscurias.

The Greeks must have been led to settle on the northern coast of the Pontus, where neither sea, sky nor earth had anything Greek about them, by the hope of large profits, the sources of which we have already indicated. Besides this they brought the neighbouring Scythians under their control, and cultivated friendly relations with the remoter tribes to such an extent that rough roads could be made across the steppes, on which caravans penetrated into the interior and even as far as the shores of the Baltic.[19]

The Greeks also endeavoured to connect their settlements on the Black Sea with their early history, that is to say, with their legends. For this purpose special use was made of the

voyage of the Argo, which sailed in an easterly direction. The country of Aeetes was supposed to be in Colchis on the eastern shores of the Black Sea, and the story of the Golden Fleece was interpreted as indicating the wealth of these regions. The first point of call after the Hellespont was Cyzicus, where there was a sanctuary of the great Mother of the gods, said to have been established by Jason. Sinope was founded, according to the assertions of the Greeks, by an Argonaut named Autolycus. Near Apsarus, Apsyrtus, son of Aeetes, was said to have been slain by his sister Medea. Moreover, the home of the Amazons was supposed to be on the south coast of the Black Sea. The north coast was the scene of the legend of Iphigenia; she was not slain at Aulis, but removed by Artemis to the Tauri, which was identified with a place in the Crimea, where strangers were sacrificed to a virgin goddess by the barbarian inhabitants. In her the Greeks recognized their own Artemis.

The Milesian spirit of enterprise found a favourable field also in the south. In Egypt the Assyrians had gained the supremacy during the first half of the seventh century, but they exercised it, according to their custom, through native princes. One of these, Psammetichus, prince of Sais, undertook to free himself and Egypt from the foreign yoke, and for this purpose put himself in communication with Gyges of Lydia, who placed Ionian and Carian mercenaries at his disposal. The attempt succeeded, and Psammetichus became independent.[20] Henceforth he placed reliance on the foreigners, and opened the country to them in a fashion which had been hitherto unknown. He built permanent camps on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile for the Ionian and Carian mercenaries. The Milesians were allowed to settle on the Bolbitic estuary. But King Amasis entered into even closer relations with the Greeks. He removed the Ionians and Carians from the Pelusiac branch of the Nile to Memphis, in order that they might guard his own person instead of the

frontier. Naucratis became a flourishing Greek city in Egypt at that time. It resembled the Syrian ports at the time of the Crusades with their Genoese and Venetian quarters. In Naucratis the various Greek settlements gathered round their different temples, just as the Italians did round their own national churches. The three Ionic cities of Teos, Clazomenae and Phocaea, together with Chios, had a sanctuary in common, the Hellenium; the three Dorian cities of Cnidus, Halicarnassus and Phaselis, with the island of Rhodes and the Aeolic Mitylene, had one also; Samos (Hera), Aegina (Zeus) and Miletus (Apollo) possessed separate ones. By means of these settlements Greek culture spread over Egypt. Psammetichus sent Egyptian youths to the Greeks who had settled in his country to be taught their language; this is said to have been the origin of the class of interpreters.[21] A peculiar trace of the presence of Greeks in Egypt far south on the Nile still exists in the form of inscriptions on the thigh of the colossal statue of Ramses at Abu Simbel in Nubia; Greek mercenaries inscribed their names there in the reign of Psammetichus II.[22]

The second Ionic town which derived importance from its extensive commercial relations was Phocaea; its situation on a promontory necessarily turned its attention seawards, and it displayed its energy chiefly in the west. Herodotus gives the Phocaeans credit for special achievements in this respect;[23] he says that they were the first Greeks to venture on long voyages, and that they discovered the Adriatic Sea, Etruria, Spain and Tartessus, and concluded an alliance with the king of Tartessus; he adds that they made their voyages not in merchant vessels, but in ships of war of fifty oars. There seems to be considerable exaggeration in this. It is recorded of Tartessus, a place in the south of Spain, that a Samian vessel was driven there out of its course, and that the Phocaeans did not make a voyage thither till after that. Their supposed discovery of Etruria is not consistent with

the fact that the Chalcidians first settled there, and it is intrinsically improbable that the Phocaeans were the first to sail into the Adriatic. They did not found colonies in the west until later, but these were of great importance.

Of the other Asiatic Greeks the Samians displayed the greatest energy at sea; we shall hear of some of their colonies later on. While Miletus and Phocaea were on the whole good friends, Samos showed jealousy of the Milesians. Miletus sided with Eretria, Samos with Chalcis.

Eretria, which was on good terms with Carystus, extended its rule over some of the islands lying to the south of Euboea, Andros, Tenos and Ceos; Chalcis, on the other hand, acquired and settled the small islands to the north, Sciathos, Icos and Peparethos. But the Chalcidians pushed farther north. In this direction they found between the mouths of the Axius and Strymon a mountainous country, running in three promontories into the sea, which, unlike the Thracian coast, exhibited in its alternations of sea and land genuine Greek characteristics. Here a large number of settlements were planted, most of them by Chalcis itself, on which account the cities were collectively called Chalcidian and the territory Chalcidice.[24] The most westerly of the three promontories, Pellene, possesses a fertile soil, and consequently the cities situated upon it devoted themselves principally to agriculture, among them Mende, founded by Eretrians, which displayed on its coins the worship of Bacchus, and Scione, which was a colony of Achaeans from Pellene. But the best position, from a commercial point of view, was occupied by Potidaea, a Corinthian colony, situated on the narrow neck of the peninsula. The central promontory, Sithonia, included the towns of Torone and Singos. The third, named Acte, with Mount Athos, still celebrated for its convents and then considered dangerous for circumnavigation, contained eight small cities. It was not till the year 432 B.C. that Perdiccas united the lesser maritime Chalcidian cities to the already

existing city of Olynthus. Eastwards of the Chalcidian cities, on the Strymonic Gulf, there were some Ionic colonies founded by the Cyclades, principally Andros; these were Argilus, Stageirus, Acanthus and Sane. Still farther east we find at first more Ionic settlements. For towards the end of the eighth century the Parians colonized Thasos, an island rich in minerals, and settled on the neighbouring coast at Apollonia, Galepsus and Oesyme.[25]

Farther still to the East we come to the territory of the Thracians. In the seventh century some citizens of Clazomenae attempted to found the town of Abdera here, but without success. The Teans were more fortunate; they settled on this spot when fleeing before the Persians, so that Abdera must be considered a Tean colony.[26] Maronea was a colony from Chios, in the district of Cicone, a region famous for its wine even in Homer's time and retaining its reputation up to this day. On the other hand, Aenus was an Ionic settlement, situated at the mouth of the Hebrus and noted for the beautiful heads of Hermes on its coins. The three so-called Thracian islands,[27] Samothrace, Imbros and Lemnos, were not completely hellenized until a later period. Samothrace, famous for its worship of the Chthonian divinities, the Cabeiri, is said to have been colonized from Samos. It may, however, be conjectured that the connection of Samothrace with Samos was inferred from the similarity of their names, and was not really historical, for Cephallenia was also called Same, yet Samians certainly never settled there.

The long narrow peninsula coming next on the east, the Thracian Chersonese, which was inhabited by the Dolonci, possessed Aeolian and Ionian settlements: the Aeolian Sestos at the narrowest part of the Hellespont, opposite the Milesian Abydos, the Tean colony Elaeus at the southern extremity, and on the isthmus, which connects the peninsula with Thrace, the Milesian and Clazomenaean colony of Cardia. In the Propontis we find the colony of Perinthus on a rocky pro-

montory between two bays; it was founded by the Samians about 599 B.C., and was afterwards called Heraclea.[28] The neighbouring Bisanthe was also of Samian origin. But the most important city in these parts was of Dorian origin, Byzantium, a Megarian colony.[29]

It is a remarkable fact that Megara, which was of little importance in Greece itself, founded such wealthy and important colonies. The Megarians were among the first Greeks who travelled westwards. But soon afterwards they began to move in an easterly direction. In 675 B.C. they built the town of Chalchedon or Chalcedon at the entrance to the Bosporus on its Asiatic side, and the town of Astacus in a bay of the Propontis. This town, which was afterwards fortified by the Athenians, was admirably situated for carrying on trade with Asia Minor, because an easily-traversed plain extended from it into the interior. The reason for settling on the Asiatic side evidently lay in the prospect of greater profit by means of intercourse with more civilized peoples. For this reason the Megarians founded also Heraclea (Pontice) on the coast of Bithynia.[30] This town commanded an extensive territory, and subsequently planted a settlement in the far north in the Taurian peninsula, at a point where numerous bays run up into the rocky table-land. This settlement was called Chersonesus, also Heraclea, and was shortly afterwards moved a little farther eastwards near the site of the modern Sebastopol. But the Megarians themselves soon saw that they had made a mistake in neglecting the northern shores of the Propontis in favour of the south coast. The blind men, as the oracle called them, founded the city of Byzantium in 658 B.C., on a point of land between the entrance to the Bosporus and the Golden Horn, a narrow bay running far into the land. Blindness was certainly not the reason of their not having selected this spot before. It had already been occupied by other Greeks on several occasions, and the sanction of the oracle was probably necessary to give

a legitimate basis to a fresh occupation. We see again and again how the Greeks swarmed from every canton around the nearest or the most distant shores of the Mediterranean, how they settled here and there in greater or less numbers, how they withdrew when prospects appeared less favourable, went to fetch other fellow-countrymen when the settlement promised to be profitable, joined forces with people of other cities when they could not collect sufficient from their own, and, in order to avoid unpleasant differences, resigned the honour of actual colonization in favour of the state which was prepared to make the most sacrifices, and could obtain a recognition of its right from Delphi. The principal branch of industry at Byzantium was the tunny fisheries; the position of the city and the local currents enabled it moreover to control the entrance and exit of all vessels which traded with the Black Sea, and specially the important corn-trade. Byzantium was evidently on good terms with Miletus, which took the lead in the Pontus. To the west of Byzantium we find the Megarian colony of Selymbria, and on the Black Sea Mesambria, founded by Byzantium and Chalcedon at a later period.

We must now turn to the west. We do not, however, propose to refer to the settlements on the Adriatic here. The only genuine Greek republics there were Epidamnus and Apollonia, Corintho-Corcyrean settlements, which we shall deal with shortly, cities which presented many strange features in their internal organization.[31] At a later period the Syracusans also acquired influence in these parts. The stream of Greek colonization flowed towards southern Italy and Sicily. Here, too, Greeks of every race vied with each other in the work of colonization. The Ionian Chalcidians took the lead. According to the statements of many ancient writers the town of Cyme was founded in Campania as early as the eleventh century B.C.[32] But the existence of a Greek township in that region at such an early date is scarcely

credible. But this does not involve a denial of the fact that isolated groups of Greeks were settled on the coast of Campania as early as B.C. 1000, and we cannot doubt that Cyme was the oldest Greek colony, recognized as such, in the west. But the Italian Cyme did not become of real importance till after the eighth century. It was founded by Chalcidians and Cymeans.

The Greek emigrants first settled upon the volcanic island of Aenaria (Ischia), whence they passed *via* Prochyte (Procida) across to the neighbouring promontory, which bounds the Phlegraean Gulf on the north. Here, upon the side of the gulf which faces north, they built Cyme on an isolated and easily-defended crag. Cyme became the parent-city of Naples at a time which we cannot exactly ascertain, al. the early history of this now so important town being enveloped in obscurity. According to Strabo, Naples was a Rhodian colony, founded before the 1st Olympiad.[33] It was originally called Parthenope, after a Siren whose grave was shown there. The worship of the Sirens is met with also on the extremity of the peninsula of Sorrento and in its neighbourhood. When we consider that Sorrento and Capri lie exactly opposite the point where Neapolis was founded, between some rising ground and a small harbour, now filled up, we can easily understand that the inhabitants of Capri were inspired with a wish to settle on this very part of the fertile mainland. And in fact we are told that Greeks of the race of the Teleboans from western Greece lived in Capreae at an early date. This points to a fact which is intelligible enough in itself, although there are few express references to it in ancient writers. Western Greece was so close to Italy that a voyage thither was the most natural thing in the world. The nearest point was the eastern extremity of Italy, the ancient Calabria. It was equally natural to follow the coast in a westerly direction. Thus it is evident that people from the Teleboan territory must have

reached the eastern and southern parts of lower Italy at quite an early date, and it would not be surprising if they penetrated as far as the Gulf of Naples, which, running deeper into the land than other Italian bays, and being, moreover, protected by picturesque islands, has a more distinctly Greek character than any other part of the coast of Italy. The scarcity of historical records of these and similar voyages is easily explained. Who would take an interest in transmitting to posterity the records of settlements made by traders and pirates? For Thucydides mentions that pirates from Cyme were the first colonizers of Zancle-Messana. But whatever may be the truth about the share of the Teleboans in peopling the Gulf of Naples, it is certain that the Cymeans planted a colony in Naples. At first Cyme was supreme over all this country.[34] Dicaearchia, between Cyme and Naples, and originally a Cymean citadel, did not become an independent city until the Samians went there in the sixth century B.C.

The next object of Greek colonization in the west, so far as it can be proved historically, was the island of Sicily,[35] a country very richly endowed by nature, with an excellent climate and valuable products, and, moreover, admirably situated for commerce and navigation. Of the barbarous races in Sicily the Elymi and Sicani dwelt in the west of the island. The former were said to be fugitives from Troy and were probably of Asiatic origin, as seems to be proved by the names Elymi (Elam) and Eryx, one of their capitals (Erech), as well as by the indigenous worship of the Erycinian Aphrodite. The latter were probably of the same race as the similarly named Sicels, who lived in the east of the island. The Sicels were certainly of Italian origin. In this island, which must at an early date have been visited at intervals by Greeks and subsequently had some Phoenician settlements, Greeks from eastern Hellas founded regular communities, that is, colonies sanctioned by the

Delphic oracle, in the second half of the eighth century. A beginning was made by the Chalcidians, who founded the town of Naxos to the north of Etna, not far from the straits, and near an altar of Apollo, upon which it was customary at a later period for the festal envoys (Theori) to offer sacrifice when travelling to Greece (735 B.C.). The name Naxos, like the prevailing worship of Bacchus in the Sicilian city, points to the share taken by the Naxians in the undertaking; the leader of the colonists, Theocles, was, according to Ephorus, an Athenian. The Chalcidians soon spread over the east coast of Sicily. Making Naxos their starting-point, they founded Catana and Leontini farther to the south about the year 729 B.C.; the former, lying at the foot of Etna and exposed to its eruptions, remained nevertheless a large and wealthy city, owing to its position on the sea; Leontini, on the other hand, being built some miles from the coast, soon lapsed into insignificance. Both towns shared in the fertile country south of Etna, Catana taking principally the lower slopes of the mountain, and Leontini the plains about the river Symaethus. The colonization of these cities was quickly followed by that of the Chalcidian Zancle, the present Messina, which soon led to the founding of Rhegium. In the straits a crescent-shaped peninsula juts out from the Sicilian coast-line, and encloses a deep sheltered harbour. Pirates from Cyme in Campania had already settled here when the Chalcidians selected the spot for a regular colony under the leadership of the Chalcidian Perieres and Cratae-menes, who was either a Cymean or a Samian. The Zancleans saw that it would be advantageous if the opposite coast of Italy were in friendly hands, and induced Chalcis to establish a settlement there. This was accomplished under the protection of Apollo, a tenth of the population being expressly designated as colonists dedicated to the service of the god, and with the assistance of some fugitive Messe-nians. Zancle and Rhegium, the city which lies in the curve

of the coast, were founded probably a little later than B.C. 730.

The next in importance of the Greek settlements in Sicily, and indeed the most powerful Greek state in the west, was a Corinthian colony—Syracuse. Corinth had been governed for several generations by kings of the house of Aletes, but in the eighth century the monarchy was abolished and an aristocracy took its place. The whole body of nobles chose a Prytanis every year from the members of the old reigning family of the Bacchiadae. The rise of the aristocracy was accompanied by many changes in the state, and was one of the reasons why the Corinthians turned their attention to colonization. But the general position of affairs in Greece also pointed in this direction. In the eighth century Miletus, Chalcis, Corinth, Megara and Achaia sent out their most important colonizing expeditions. There was a combination of two elements: the rise in power and wealth of the cities, and internal disturbances, which made the removal of part of the population desirable. The colonizing communities were reorganized about B.C. 1000. They had existed for about two centuries and a half under kingly rule; their prosperity had increased and the power of the nobles had grown. The nobles then put an end to the monarchy. If, as we may assume, the new aristocracy showed itself less friendly towards the people than the monarchy had been, this must have been an inducement to the members of the less privileged classes to resort to emigration. There were always some nobles who were ready to do the same, and glad to put themselves at the head of the band of emigrants. This was the case with Corinth.

The position of the city, as we are aware, was admirably adapted for commerce. It had three harbours, Cenchreae and Schoenus, on its eastern side in the Saronic Gulf, and Lechaeum on the west in the Gulf of Corinth. The Corinthians were famous for their pottery and shipbuilding.

They took an active part in the suppression of piracy. In the east they occupied an important point in Chalcidice; in the west also there were Corinthian colonies: Chalcis and Molycrea in Aetolia, and Anactorium in Acarnania, farther north, Ambracia, Apollonia and Epidamnus; and, most important of all, Corcyra and Syracuse. We shall only discuss the two latter here; they are among the earliest colonies of the city.

Corcyra,[36] said to be the land of the Phaeacians, is the most northerly of the Ionian islands. It was inhabited by Illyrian Liburnians when the first Greek colonists, the Eretrians, settled there. They were followed by the Corinthians, it is said in the same year that they founded Syracuse (734 B.C.). The island is beautiful and fertile, and the city, which is on a projecting point of the coast, has two good harbours. Corcyra soon became rich and powerful. Its coins show that the inhabitants felt themselves to be connected more closely with Eretria and Carystus than with Corinth. This explains why the Corcyreans felt little sympathy for Corinth, which was on friendly terms with Chalcis, the rival of Eretria. The opposition between Corinth and Corcyra resulted at an early date in a war, in which the first naval battle in Greek history took place, according to Thucydides about 260 years before the end of the Peloponnesian war.

Archias of Corinth, who is described as the tenth descendant of Temenus, placed himself at the head of a number of Corinthian emigrants, who discovered the most suitable spot for a settlement upon the east coast of Sicily, the small island of Ortygia, at the entrance of a sheltered bay affording a good harbour, into which the river Anapus emptied itself. Upon the island there was an abundant spring of the same name as that of Chalcis in Euboea, Arethusa, but the Sicilian Arethusa was still more famous, because the Peloponnesian river the Alpheius was supposed to

reappear in it. The names and the legends point to previous settlements by Euboeans from Chalcis, and perhaps also by Greeks from Elis, but the oracle obtained at Delphi secured the Corinthians in permanent possession. The city soon became important and spread over the adjacent mainland northwards beyond a short strip of low-lying land up to an extensive plateau, the site of Achradina, which was second in importance to Ortygia in the city of Syracuse. Between Ortygia and Achradina there was a smaller harbour. The Syracusans made themselves masters either directly or indirectly of a large portion of the south-east corner of Sicily, and planted colonies there: Acrae (now Palazzolo) in 664, Casmenae in 644 and Camarina in 599. Of these the last, being the farthest removed from Syracuse, alone achieved independent importance.

The Megarians visited Sicily about the same time as the Corinthians. As they also possessed a harbour on the Corinthian Gulf, in Pegae, they could easily undertake voyages both in a westerly and easterly direction. They first occupied the small peninsula of Thapsus (Magnisi), not far to the north of Syracuse. Then they settled still farther northwards on the same Gulf, now called the Gulf of Augusta, at a point on the coast ceded to them by Hyblon, a prince of the Sicels, which was called Hybla, and later Megara Hyblaea, in a district famous for its honey.[37]

We must now return to Italy, which also received important Greek settlements in the latter half of the eighth century, but rather later than the east coast of Sicily. Italy splits into two branches towards the south, the western half continuing the Apennine range, and the eastern consisting of an extensive plateau. Both, especially towards their extremities, are watered by only short streams. Between them, however, lies a plain of some extent, traversed by rivers descending from the Apennines and flowing into the Gulf of Tarentum, which separates the two peninsulas. The original inhabitants of

these districts were in the east the Messapians, the Sallentini and the Calabri, after whom the whole peninsula was called Calabria; in the centre and west were Sicels (Italians), Chones and Oenotrians. All these peoples belonged to the family which includes the Greeks and Romans; probably the Messapians were more closely allied to the northern Greeks, and the rest to the Romans. The whole of this territory, corresponding to the modern Terra di Otranto, Basilicata and Calabria, a name which, as is well known, has changed its position, was colonized by the Greeks, and hellenized to such an extent that it received the name of "Greater Greece." The chronology of the founding of these cities is not so certain as the Sicilian; we shall therefore not be able to keep to chronological order in the following account.[38]

The oldest city of Greater Greece appears to have been Sybaris, founded by Achaeans and Troizenians, who were afterwards driven out by the Achaeans on the lower Crathis, about 720 B.C. Sybaris had no harbour and so never became a naval power: but its territory was exceptionally fertile. The wealth of the city became proverbial. Achaeans were also the founders of Croton, which lay close to the south on the Lacinian promontory, and formed a marked contrast to Sybaris in its general character. While we find no specially characteristic god in Sybaris, in Croton the ruling divinities were Apollo, Hera of the Lacinian promontory, and Heracles, who was said to have sojourned there in primitive times.

But the genuine history of these Italian cities, like that of the cities of eastern Greece, was preceded by legends, which were supposed to prove the existence of a very ancient connection between Italy and Greece. According to them the Greek colonies originated in the times of the heroes and demi-gods. What was done in the east by the Argonauts was accomplished in the west by Heracles and the heroes returning from the Trojan war. The basis of these legends is the fact that intercourse between Greece and lower Italy existed in remote

ages, and that Greeks had occasionally settled on the shores of southern Italy in very early times. Thus, if we follow the legends, another Achaean city, Metapontum, lying farther to the north-east on the Gulf of Tarentum, also dates from the Trojan war; it marks the boundary of Achaean territory in this direction, and was famous for its fertile plains. The true date of the founding of Metapontum cannot be ascertained.

We now come to the Doric Tarentum, which claimed to have been a Spartan colony. Even after the age of Lycurgus Sparta had experienced moments, when the discontent of a number of the less privileged citizens threatened to destroy the community, and had averted the evil by sending out a colonizing expedition. The oracle named Taras as the spot for the settlement. In the farthest corner of the gulf is a small bay, connected with the open sea by a narrow channel; the new city was founded on the tongue of land which separates the bay from the sea, in a lovely fertile district, shortly before 700 B.C. Taras soon became important for its manufactures — dye-works, weaving and pottery — and its commerce, and obtained great influence over the whole of the Calabrian peninsula, in which Callipolis (Gallipoli) and Hydrus (Otranto) were Tarentine colonies. The city of Brentesion (Brindisi), the best harbour in the Adriatic, was the capital of the Messapians, who successfully opposed Tarentum. The low country farther to the north on the Adriatic as far as the promontory of Mt. Garganus, called Iapygia or Apulia, came under the civilizing, if not the political, influence of Tarentum.

Between the territory of Metapontum and Sybaris there remained a stretch of unoccupied territory, which was probably settled in the first half of the seventh century by the Ionians of Asia Minor. The Lydian king Gyges conquered Colophon about 680 B.C., and many Colophonians emigrated and founded Polieion or Siris in the plain between Metapontum and Sybaris. This city, however, did not last for two

centuries, as it was destroyed by its Achaean neighbours in the sixth century. About the same time a city was founded by the Locri not far from the southernmost point of Italy near Cape Zephyrium on the territory of the Sicels, and received the name of Locri Epizephyrii. Its chief pursuit was agriculture, and it has a great name in the history of Greek civilization from its celebrated legislator Zaleucus.[39] The coast-line between Croton and Locri was for the most part subject to the former of these two cities, and here were Scylletion (Squillace) and Caulonia, which is clearly a colony from Croton.

This completes Greater Greece proper, that is, the semicircle of cities lying round the Gulf of Tarentum. But in a wider sense the name includes the colonies which proceeded from the more westerly of these cities across the mainland as far as the Tyrrhenian Sea. Of these Siris must be mentioned first, a town which remained on friendly terms with Pyxus.[40] Sybaris distinguished herself most in this respect by founding a colony as far as the distant Gulf of Salerno, in a low-lying plain near the sea-shore, the rose-bearing Poseidonia (Paestum), so famous in the present day for the majestic ruins of its Greek temples.[41] Pyxus, the modern Policastro, must also have been originally founded by Sybaris. Croton had not to travel so far to reach the western sea. Its colonies there were Temesa or Tempsa, and Terina, the latter chiefly famous for its beautiful coins. Lastly Locri also pushed westwards, as far as Medma and Hipponion, called Vibo in later times, and close to the modern Monteleone. We shall refer to Elea presently.

To return to Sicily. On the north coast Himera was founded by Ionians from Zancle and a few Dorians in 648; but the Ionian element predominated. The Greeks were unable to penetrate farther west along the north coast, because the Phoenicians were concentrated there. The latter possessed at the outset all the promontories and small islands around Sicily, but when the Greeks came there they retired to three

places, which from their position in the west of the island facilitated their intercourse with their Iberian and Libyan possessions: Solus, Panormus (the central part of the modern Palermo), and Motye, near the western extremity of Sicily. The Greeks made their further advances on the south coast, which has no good harbours and on this account was neglected by the Phoenicians. In 689 some Cretans and Lindians from Rhodes founded the town of Gela (Terranova) on a hill between the sea and the river Gelas, which commanded a very fertile plain. In 628 the Hyblaean Megara, with the aid of citizens from the Greek parent-city, founded the town of Selinus not far from the western end of the island and close to the sea; it soon became large and powerful, as is shown by the enormous remains of its temples. Between Gela and Selinus, however, there remained a long stretch of coast. On this the Geloans in 581 took possession of an important point, a bowl-shaped plateau about 1000 feet above the sea and two or three miles distant from it; here the city of Akragas was planned on a grand scale, and soon attained considerable power and prosperity. About the same time the Rhodians and Cnidians planted a settlement upon Lipara, the largest of the Aeolian or Liparean islands, which became a stronghold against the pirates of the Tyrrhenian Sea.[42]

In the west of the Mediterranean power was in the hands of the Etruscans, the Phoenicians, and the Carthaginians, who prevented the rise of Greek naval enterprise. They were unable, however, to prevent the establishment of an important Greek settlement, Massalia, which withdrew a large district from the influence of the above nations. The founders of Massalia were Phocaeans (about 600 B.C.); the district was inhabited by the Salyes, a Ligurian tribe. The legend states that the colonization of it was facilitated by the marriage of the Ionian leader with the daughter of the native king. Soon afterwards quarrels arose between the Greeks and the natives, in which the love of a native

woman for a Greek youth again saved the Massaliots. The Phocaeans selected a very favourable spot for their settlement, just where a harbour, about 700 yards long and 300 broad, is connected with the sea by a narrow entrance protected by rocky promontories. The remembrance of their native city plainly influenced their choice of a settlement; Phocaea, Massalia and Velia, all lie on rocky headlands, fit eyries for a bold race of sailors. Massalia extended her influence eastwards along the Ligurian coast by means of the colonies of Nicaea (Nice) and Monoecus (Monaco), westwards over part of the Iberian coast by those of Emporiae (Ampurias) and Rhode (Rosas). Massalia did for trade in a northerly direction across the mainland what the Milesian colonies accomplished on the north coast of the Black Sea. The Massaliots satisfied their truly Ionic curiosity by exploring foreign countries. In the fourth century a celebrated traveller, Pytheas, was a native of this city.[43]

Thucydides says that the Phocaeans, when they founded Massalia, defeated the Carthaginians in a naval war. As a matter of fact there must have arisen struggles in the western Mediterranean between the Greeks, who were settling there, and the peoples who had hitherto been masters of those seas. The Phocaeans encroached on part of the territory of the Etruscans in forming a colony in Corsica, the city of Alalia, about 566 B.C. This colony, however, did not last long, although after the surrender of Phocaea it was reinforced in 545 B.C. by inhabitants of the latter city who were fleeing from the Persians. The Carthaginians and Etruscans formed an alliance to oppose these Greeks. A naval battle took place, in which sixty Greek triremes fought against twice that number of Carthaginian and Etruscan ships and, as the Greeks maintained, with success. But as they lost forty vessels in the action it was a Cadmean victory, in which the conquerors suffered as much as the conquered. In consequence the Greeks left Alalia and retired to Rhegium, to concert measures quietly

among the friendly Chalcidians. They learned that to the south of Poseidonia, upon a promontory on the Italian coast, there was a place belonging to the Oscans, suitable for founding a colony. This they acquired and built there a city, which soon became one of the most prosperous of lower Italy: Hyele, also called Elea, by the Romans Velia (540 B.C.).

A century before this the circle of Greek colonies round the Mediterranean had been completed by a settlement in North Africa. To the west of Egypt, on the northern edge of the desert, a rounded plateau projects into the sea, fertilized by springs and showers, and offering oportunities for trade with the interior. Here, in the seventh century B.C. (about 630), a colony was founded by Dorians from the Peloponnese and from Thera, under the leadership of Battus; the city of Cyrene was built on a well-watered spot, and other places, notably Barca, were occupied. The whole country was called Cyrenaice, and attained to great material prosperity, though the inhabitants adapted themselves readily to all the customs of the country in which they lived and became semi-barbarians. The tyranny (for the hereditary monarchy of Battus and Arcesilaus assumed that character) produced peculiar results, which do not appear elsewhere in Greek history.[44]

Thus in the latter half of the sixth century we find the Greeks—in Europe compactly grouped around the religious centres which constituted the spiritual ties of the whole Hellenic race, in Asia Minor confined to the edge of the west coast, which, however, like lower Italy and a part of Sicily, had become quite hellenized, and finally scattered over every shore of the eastern and central Mediterranean, making themselves acquainted with the manners and customs of the natives, trading with their products, and enriching the Greek mind with an abundance of ideas and views, such as has rarely fallen to the lot of any other people.

NOTES

1. Raoul-Rochette, Histoire critique de l'établissement des colonies grecques, Par. 1815 (four octavo volumes), draws no distinction between legend and history. Hermann's Staatsalterthümer Abschn. IV. contains the outlines of a critical history of Greek colonization ; so does Busolt, Gr. G. I.—An excellent introduction to the history of Greek colonization is given by E. Curtius, Die Griechen in der Diaspora, Sitzungsber. der königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1882. The mixed character of the population of the colonies is emphasized by Hermann, St. A. § 86, in quoting the words used in Thuc. 1, 27, pointing to a kind of joint-stock speculation. For the west, O. Meltzer's Geschichte der Karthager, I. Berl. 1879, has many excellent passages. In the following notes I have thought it best, in order not to take up too much space, to refrain from quoting passages from ancient authors regarding the founding of the various cities.

2. The history of the Greek maritime states includes that of the supremacy of the seas, of which the ancient historians (Castor, Ephorus, Sosibius ?) have made a chronological table, which is given by Diodorus (through Eusebius) *e.g.* in Dindorf's Diodor, Teubn. II. p. 116. The list (comprising seventeen states) begins with the Trojan war, after which the supremacy of the sea was held in succession by Lydians, Pelasgians, Thracians, Rhodians, Phrygians, Cyprians, Phoenicians and Egyptians (at this point we have reached about 800 B.C.) ; then from the middle of the eighth century by the Milesians (eighteen years !), Carians, Lesbians, Phocaeans (to the middle of the sixth century), and from the middle of the sixth until 480 by the Samians, the Lacedaemonians (517-15), the Naxians (515-505), the Eretrians (505-490), and the Aeginetans (490-480). The close of the maritime supremacy of a particular state appears to be sometimes fixed after a great blow sustained by it, and probably the sole value of the enumeration lies in the records of disasters of this kind, no doubt a considerable one if we could only clear up the details. But for the chronological order of the maritime importance of the Greek states the list is worthless. For it does not even mention Chalcis and Corinth ! Cf. Heyne in the Nov. comm. soc. Gotting. I. and II. ; Goodwin, De potentiae veterum gentium maritimae epochis, Gotting. 1855 ; and recently, V. Floigl, Cyrus and Herodotus, Lpz. 1881, p. 141.

3. Ionians took Carian wives, Herod. 1, 146, 147.

4. For Ephesus, Paus. 7, 2, 8 ; Steph. Byz. s.v. *Βένα*.

5. Miletus, Con. narr. 44 ; Nic. Dam. 54 M. Verf. ; Ar. Pol. 5, 4, 5.

6. Colophon, Strab. 14, 643.

7. Thrasybulus, Her. 5, 92 ; 1, 20-22 ; 5, 28 ; Plut. Qu. Gr. 32 ; Ath. 12, 524. For the doubtful chronology, Duncker, 6, 290 ; Ar. Pol. 3, 8, 3 and 5, 8, 7, inverts the *rôles* and makes Periander give the advice to Thrasybulus. It is merely an anecdote which illustrates the nature of a tyranny.

8. The catastrophe in Samos, Plut. Qu. Gr. 57.

9. For Pittacus, cf. the article in Pauly's R. Enc

10. For Cyme, esp. Herakl. Pont. fr. 11.

11. For Amphidamas, Hes. Op. et D. 652 seq. ; Plut. conv. sept. p. 10.

12. Chalcis, Herod. 5, 77 ; Strab. 10, 447 ; Ar. Pol. 4, 3, 2 ; Herakl. Pont. 31 (Müll.) For the Lelantian war cf. K. Fr. Hermann's Gesammelte Abhandlungen and Dondorff, De rebus Chalcidensium, Halle, 1855 ; for the general grouping of the peoples connected therewith, cf. Holm, Lange Fehde in the Abh. zu E. Curtius 70. Geburtstag. There were important metal industries in Chalcis. The Corinthians imported many raw products from it.

13. The importance of the Cyclades in ancient Greek history is considerable, but has hitherto been little considered as a connected whole. Since the earlier researches noticed by Bursian in the second volume of his Greek Geography, Delos has been chiefly explored by the French (especially Homolle) ; more recently Th. Bent has conducted researches on many of the Cyclades (Journal of Hellenic Studies, V). Cf. Busolt, Gr. G. I. 206-12.

14. Phocaea and Genoa built on cliffs, Miletus and Venice on low ground. The comparison might be carried still further.

15. For the colonies of Miletus, Scymn. Ch. 734, and Strabo, 14, 635. The dates of the founding of the eastern colonies require fresh investigation. Accounts of these are to be found chiefly in Strabo, Scymnus, and Steph. Byz.—L. Bürchner, Die Besiedelung des Pontos Euxeinos durch die Milesier, I. Kempten, 1885 (with sketch-map), a work of great industry. Clazomenaeans lived in the neighbourhood of the Palus Maeotis, Strab. 11, 494 ; Plin. 4, 7.

16. The early history of Sinope is very uncertain. Cf. Streuber, Sinope, Bas. 1855 ; Sengesbusch, Quaest. Sinopicar. spec., Berl. 1846. The coins of Sinope : Six, Sinope in the Num. Chron. 1885. Cf. finally, Bürchner, pp. 56-66, who in Part I. deals specially with Trapezus, Kerasus, Cotyora, and Istrus. For the population of the south coast of the Pontus, E. Meyer, Geschichte des Königr. Pontos, Lpz. 1879.

17. For Cyzicus, Marquardt, Cyzikus und s. Gebiet, Berl. 1836.

18. For the Pontus Euxinus, Preller, Ueber die Bedeutung des schwarzen Meeres für Handel und Verkehr d. alten Welt, Dorp. 1842. For the Greek colonies in the south of Russia, Becker, Die Nordgestade des Pontus Euxinus, Petersb. 1852 ; Muralt, Mélanges d'Antiquités, Zür. 1852 ; Ouvaroff, Recherches sur les antiquités de la Russie méridionale, Petersb. 1855 ; Neumann, Die Hellenen im Skythenlande, Berl. 1855 ; Kiepert, Lehrb. d. alten Geogr., § 303 seq. ; Raoul-Rochette, Antiquités grecques du Bospore Cimmérien, Par. 1822 ; Köppen, Alterthümer am Nordgestade des Pontos, Vienna, 1823 ; Köhler, Serapis, Petersb. 1850 ; (Gille), Antiq. du Bosp. Cimm. 1854 ; new edition by Sal. Reinach, Par. 1892 ; finally, the annual Comptes-rendus de la Commission Archéologique de S. Pétersbourg, 1859 seq., mainly compiled by Stephani.—The character of the countries north of the Black Sea is vividly described by Herodotus (IV.)

19. The routes from the Black Sea to the north have been discussed by Genthe in the Carlsruhe Philologenversammlung, 1882

20. Psammetichus made himself master of Egypt by the aid of Greeks, Herod. 2, 147-152 ; Diod. 1, 66 ; acc. to Str. 17, 801, Psammetichus made war on Inarus with thirty ships sent to him from Miletus. Criticism of these traditions by Wiedemann, Aegypt. Gesch. Gotha 1884, p. 606 seq.

21. For Amasis and the Greeks, cf. Wiedemann, Aeg. Gesch. p. 652 seq., where the references are collected. Abydos is called a Milesian colony by Steph. Byz. s. v. ; the Great Oasis inhabited by Samians acc. to Herod. 3, 26. Locus classicus, Herod. 2, 177 seq. Naucratis obtained the privilege of collecting customs duties, as did many ports in the Middle Ages. The Greek quarter called *στρατόπεδα*, Her. 1, 154. Naucratis has now been discovered by Flinders Petrie ; it was in the neighbourhood of Damanhur. It was more ancient than Amasis, and probably belonged to the reign of Psammetichus. The excavations have been conducted by Flinders Petrie and Ernest Gardner. Cf. Naucratis I. by Petrie and II. by Gardner, and F. Petrie, Ten Years' Digging in Egypt, Lond. 1892.

22. For the inscriptions at Abu Simbel, cf. Wiedemann I. 1, 632.

23. For the Phocaeans, Herod. 1, 163.

24. For Chalcidice, Hoffmann, Descript. Chalcidicae, Bromb. 1854. Andros begins to colonize when Eretria declines.

25. For Thasos, Hasselbach, De Insula Thaso, Marb. 1838 ; Perrot, Mém. sur l'île de Thasos, Par. 1864 (Arch. des missions scientifiques) ; Conze, Reise auf den Ins. d. thr. Meeres, Hann. 1860.

26. For Abdera, K. Fr. Hermann, Ges. Abh. p. 90 seq. Its connection with Teos is shown by the griffin on the coins of both cities. Thracian coins betray the influence of Abdera. Panticapaeum also had a griffin, while Phanagorea, which lay opposite, was also regarded as a Tean colony.

27. For the islands of the Thracian Sea see the above-quoted work of Conze. For Samothrace, Curtius, Monatsber. der Berl. Akad. 1855. Scientific expeditions have been sent to this island by Austria, resulting in a splendid work by Conze, Hauser and Niemann, Vienna, 1875 and 1880.

28. For the Thracian Chersonese, Schultz, De Chers. thr. Berl. 1853 ; Hauvette-Besnault in the Bull. de Corr. hell. 1881.

29. For Megara, Reinganum, Das alte Megara, Berl. 1825 ; Vogt, De rebus Megarens. Marb. 1857. For Byzantium we may refer, in preference to other works, to the copious and sensible article by Frick in Pauly's R. E. I. 2^2, which embraces the whole body of ancient and modern materials. Of the earlier and more exhaustive writings, the following are the most important: Dionysii Byzantii Anaplus Bospori in Müller's Geogr. min. II. ; Hesych. Miles. de orig. urbis Const. in Müller's Fr. H. Gr. IV. ; P. Gyllius, De topographia Const. Lugd. 1561-62, and in Gronov's Thes. VI. ; Heyne, Antiqu. Byzantinae in den Comm. Soc. Gott. ; Hammer, Constantinopel und der Bosporus, 2 Bde. Pesth, 1822 ; Schwen, Hist. Byz. Hal. 1875 ; Πασπάτης, Βυζαντιναὶ μελέται, 1877 ; Dethier und Mordtmann, Epigr. von Byzantion, Vienna, Ak. 1864.

30. For Heraclea, Polsberw, De rebus Heracleae Ponti, Brandenbg. 1833, also his De rebus Chersonesitarum et Callatianorum, Berl. 1838 ; Köhne, Beitr. z. Gesch. und Archaeologie von Chersonesos in Taurien, Petersb. 1848 ; Becker, De Herakleot. Halbinsel, 1856 ; Therion, De civitat. quae a Graecis in Cherson. taur. cond. fuer. Nancy, 1884 ; Kämmel, Heracleotica, Plauen, 1869 ; Stiene, De Heracl. Pontic. republ. Monast. 1870 ; Schneiderwirth, Heraclea am Pontus, Heiligenst. 1882, 1884.

31. In Epidamnus the artizans called δημόσιοι, Ar. Pol. 2, 4, 13.

32. Date of the foundation of Cyme, Hieron. Sch. 2, 60, 61, Abr. 968 = 1046 B.C. Acc. to Vell. 1, 4, it was before the settlement of the Ionian colonies in Asia, hence about the same date. Duncker (5, 485) suspects a confusion with the Cyme in Asia, originating in Rome after Virgil had made Aeneas receive the prophecies of the Sibyl at Cumae. Helbig has recently, in Das homer. Epos, Lpz. 1884, pp. 321-323, referred to the date of the founding of Cyme. He considers it to be later than the Greek colonies on the east coast of Sicily. The last discussion of the question is by Busolt, Gr. G. I. 247 seq., who considers Cyme to be as ancient as,

perhaps more ancient than, the Sicilian colonies. The opinion of the ancients, that the well-known Asiatic Cyme co-operated in founding the Campanian city, is now generally rejected in favour of the Euboean Cyme, of which there are hardly any traces left. Cyme, acc. to Strabo 5, 243, was founded by the united efforts of Chalcidians and Cymaeans, and was the earliest Greek city in Italy and Sicily. I draw attention once more to the fact that no Italian coast-line has such a distinctly Greek character as the country lying between the promontory of Minerva and Gaeta, and that the rock of Cyme is well placed for command of the sea, and I see no objection to the view that Cyme was a nest of Greek pirates and older than Naxos in Sicily.—For Campania generally cf. J. Beloch, Campanien, Topograph. Gesch. und Leben d. Umg. Neapels im Alterthum, Berl. 1879, with atlas, in which the local literature is quoted. The archaeological side of the question, which is not so fully treated by Beloch, is discussed in an article by Fr. v. Duhn (*e.g.* in the Verh. der Trierer Philologenvers.), and in reports of excavations by E. Stevens in the Notizie degli Scavi. For the topography of the city of Naples the best authority is B. Capasso, Sull' antico sito di Napoli e Palepoli, Nap. 1855.

33. For the voyages of the Rhodians, Strabo, 14, 654. According to him, they went at that time to Iberia, where they founded Rhode; they founded Parthenope among the Opicii, Elpiae among the Daunians, jointly with the Coans. According to some writers, says Strabo, after the return from Troy they colonized the Gymnesiae, *i.e.* the Balearic Islands.

34. Destruction of Naples by Cyme, Lut. Cat. fr. 7 ap. Philarg. ad Georg. 4, 564. The site of a Palaeopolis near Naples, which is only mentioned in the time of the Romans, and must have had a separate existence about 328-326 B.C., is uncertain; Liv. 8, 22-26, and Fasti Triumph. a. u. 427.

35. All the questions relating to the island of Sicily and its colonization are treated by Ad. Holm, Geschichte Siciliens im Alterthum, 2 Bde. with maps, Lpz. 1870 and 1874, in which all the earlier works of any importance are quoted. The most important of these are Thom. Fazelli, De rebus Siculis decades duae, Pan. 1558, and in Graev. Thes. I.; Amico, Lexicon topographicum Siculum, Pan. 1757-59, 3 vols.; D'Orville, Sicula, Amst. 1764; Houel, Voyage pittoresque, Par. 1782-87, 4 vols. fol.; Serradifalco, Antichità di Sicilia, 5 vols. in fol. with 174 Plates; Dennis, Handbook for Travellers in Sicily, Lond., Murray, 1864. Coins:—the works of Salinas and the catalogue of the British Museum, division Sicily; for Syracuse in particular, Head, History of the coinage of Syracuse, Lond. 1874; the Roman

inscriptions in the Corpus Inscrip. Latin. Reports in the Bursian-'sche Jahresberichte by Holm. For the Elymi, Sicani and Sicels cf. Holm. G. S. I. Locus classicus for the colonization of Sicily by the Greeks and for previous settlements on the island, Thuc. 6, 1 seq. ; cf. also Strabo in the 6th Book ; Diod. 5, 2 seq. ; Dion. Hal. 1, 22 seq.—For the uncertainty of the dates of the colonization of Sicily and lower Italy, see G. Busolt in the Rhein. Mus. 1885.—For Catane, Ad. Holm, Das alte Catania, Lüb. 1873, with map.—For Leontini, Schubring's Sicilische Studien, Zeitschr. d. Ges. für Erdkunde, IX.—For Zancle, Ebel, De Zanclensium Mess. rebus, Berol. 1842 ; Siefert, Zancle Messana, Alt. 1854.—For Syracuse, cf. the Topographia archeologica di Siracusa esequita per ordine del Min. della P. Istr. da S. Cavallari, Ad. Holm e Cr. Cavallari, Pal. 1883, 4 vols. with 15 Plates in fol. This book contains a complete historical topography of Syracuse up to the times of the Roman Empire by the author of the present history, and detailed quotations from the earlier and in part very valuable works of Schubring and others, which are therefore not given here. —For the commerce and foreign relations of Corinth, see E. Curtius, Studien zur Geschichte von Corinth, in Hermes, X. Services of the Corinthians in establishing peace at sea, Thuc. 1, 13. Of the colonies of Syracuse only Camarina became important ; cf. Schubring, Kamarina, Philologus, XXXII. 3.

36. Corcyra, its exact shape, cf. Strab. 6, 269 ; Tim. quoted in Schol. Ap. Rh. 4, 1216 ; Mustoxidi, Illustrazioni Corciresi, Mil. 1811-1814. By the same, Delle cose Corciresi, I. Corf. 1848 ; Müller, De Corcyraeor. republ. Gott. 1835 ; Janske, De rebus Corcyr. Bresl. 1849 ; Riemann, Rech. arch. sur les îles Ion. in the Bibl. des écoles de Rome et d'Athènes, 1879-80. Naval engagement between Corinthians and Corcyraeans, Thuc. 1, 13.

37. For Megara Hyblaea, cf. Schubring, Umwanderung des megarischen Meerbusens in Sicilien in D. Ztschr. f. allgem. Erdk. Neue F. 17.

38. Greater Greece. The conception Μεγάλη Ἑλλάς—magna or major Graecia—differs in ancient writers. Properly speaking, it embraces the cities from Tarentum to Locris, cf. Plin. 3, 95 ; in Polyb. 2, 39, the expression is specified as having been in use in the time of the Pythagoreans. Acc. to Athen. 12, 523, it is extended to πᾶσα σχεδὸν ἡ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν κατοίκησις of the Greeks ; acc. to Strabo, 253, even Sicily was included.—Of comprehensive works on Magna Graecia we must give the first place to the most recent by Fr. Lenormant, La grande Grèce, 3 vols. Par. 1881, and A travers l'Apulie et la Lucanie, 2 vols. Par. 1883, in which is to be found much that is new and good ; unfortunately they

appear to be written to a certain extent more from memory than by constant reference to the original authorities. Older works are: —Cluvers, Italia antiqua; Romanelli, Antica topografia storica del regno di Napoli, 3 vols. Naples, 1815; G. F. Grotefend, Zur Geographie und Gesch. von Alt-Italien, 5 Hefte, Hannov. 1840-42; Rathgeber, Grossgriechenland und Pythagoras, Gotha, 1866. The Roman Inscriptions in the Corpus Insc. Lat., the coins by Carelli and Sambon, Recherches sur les monnaies de la presqu' île italique, Napl. 1870, and the section Italy in the catalogue of the British Museum.—I am unable to quote the principal passages in the ancient writers referring to each city; in general cf. the accounts of Strabo, Scymnus, Plinius (III.), Lycophrons Alexandra, with commentary, a large part of Diodorus, and some dates in Hieronymus. Of modern works on separate cities I may mention in the first place Marincola-Pistoja, who has written on Sibari (Nap. 1845), on Pandosia, Petelia, Scillezio (Skylletion), Caulonia, Mesma, Ipponio, Temesa, which have appeared as monographs in Catanzaro between 1866 and 1872.—On Sybaris, Ulrich, Rerum Sybarit. capita selecta, Berol. 1836. Topography by Cavallari in the Notizie degli Scavi (Lincei), Rom. 1879.—Croton: Grosser, Geschichte und Alterthümer der Stadt Croton, Minden, 1867, 1868.—Everything that has come down to us from antiquity about Tarentum has been well put together by R. Lorentz in various essays: De orig. Tar. Berol. 1827, De civitate Tar. Numb. 1833, De rebus sacris et artibus, Clev. 1836, Res gestae, Elberf. 1838 and Luccar. 1841. For its topography, the recent researches of L. Viola in the Notizie d. Sc. 1881, are a standard work. Brentesion is certainly, according to Polybius, 10, 1, younger than Tarentum, but is that necessarily true?—Metapontum is treated by de Luynes et Debacq, Métaponte, Par. 1833, and by Holländer, De rebus Metapontinorum, Gött. 1851.—For Siris and Heraclea Lorentz, R. G. Tar. I. 8-16, and Ricciardi, Viaggio alla Siritide, Nap. 1872.—Rhegium: Morisani, Inscr. Reginae, Neap. 1770, and Schneidewin, Diana Phacelitis, Gött. 1852. On Calabria, in the modern sense of the word, the earlier works of Barri, Rome, 1571; Marafioti, Nap. 1596; and L. Grimaldi, Stud. archeol. sulla Cal. ultra II. Nap. 1845, as well as much by the author of the present work in Bursian's Jahresberichte. — The collective history of Magna Graecia, from the earliest times onwards, has been most unsatisfactorily recorded, far more so than that of Sicily. There are two reasons for this. The flourishing cities of Magna Graecia did not produce a single historian of importance, while Sicily had several; hence the history of Magna Graecia has only been noticed *en passant* by writers belonging to other countries who took no

special interest in it. It is true that Timaeus devoted considerable attention to Magna Graecia; but in the first place he was a Sicilian, and therefore prejudiced in favour of his native country, and secondly, the bent of his mind was towards the compilation of old traditions, of which we already have a large and interesting collection relating to Magna Graecia. Satisfactory *data* of the more historic periods are wanting. The second reason is that Magna Graecia was never of political importance like Sicily under its tyrants for the space of four centuries; it had neither geographical, political nor intellectual unity. Hence the ancient historians were seldom in the position of being obliged to refer to the history of its cities, a thing they could not well avoid doing in the case of Syracuse. Lastly, the doctrines of Pythagoras exercised a very unfavourable influence upon the composition of history. So many legends have gathered round Pythagoras that we can hardly even form an idea of how much the history of Magna Graecia at the close of the sixth century has been distorted by them. Thus our materials consist only of legends of the early period and fables of the sixth century; in the fifth century Magna Graecia had already become of minor importance.

39. There was much discussion in ancient times concerning the origin of Locri; cf. Polyb. 12, 5 seq. At one time it is referred to the Ozolian Locrians, at another to the Opuntian; the former view is taken by Str. 6, 259. According to Aristotle the first comers were said to have been runaway slaves and similar rabble, but the women of noble extraction. Hence the custom in this city of reckoning nobility by descent on the female side. The question has been treated by Bachofen, Das Mutterrecht, Stuttg. 1861, p. 309 seq. Timaeus denies the low origin of the first colonists. The non-participation of noble Locrians is ascribed by tradition, which Aristotle follows, to the circumstance that at that time they were helping the Spartans against the Messenians. According to Paus. 3, 3, 1, the Spartans under King Polydorus founded Locri and Croton.—Lenormant has treated Scylletion, especially its position, in great detail, La gr. Gr. II. 329 seq.—Caulonia is only interesting for its coins.

40. Relations between Siris and Pyxus, Percy Gardner, Types, p. 31; Coins of the Ancients, I, C, 14.

41. Poseidonia, Str. 6, 251. Its ruins were not carefully examined till about the middle of the eighteenth century. Publications in Naples (Sei vedute di Pesto, Nap. 1756), in Paris (Soufflot, Suite de plans, etc. Par. 1760), in London (Mayer, The Ruins of Paestum, 1767). Later, Delagardette, Les ruines de Paestum, Par. 1799. Cf. Mazocchi, Tab. Heracl., p. 498 seq.;

Crosse, Comm. qua in Paesti origg., etc. Halle, 1768 ; Labrouste, Temples de Paestum in Restaur. des monum. anciens par les archit. de l'Acad. de France à Rome, Par. 1877, 21 plates. Fine sketches in Lenormant, A travers l'Apulie II. 167-224.

42. For Himera, see Cavallari, Avanzi d'Imera Bull. d. comm. d. arch. di Sicil., No. 2 and Holm. G. Sic, I. 393.—For the three Phoenician cities of Solus, Panormus and Motye, see Holm, G. S. I. 371-373. Following Cluver, I have endeavoured to prove that Panormus owed its origin to scattered bands of Greeks in Studî di storia palermitana in the Arch. stor. sic. IV. Pal. 1880. For Motye, cf. I. Coglitore, Mozia, in the Arch. stor. sic. 1884.—For Gela, Schubring, Histor.-geogr. Studien über Alt-Sicilien, Rh. Mus. N.F. XXVIII.—For Selinus, Reinganum, Selinus und sein Gebiet, Lpz. 1872 ; Schubring, Topographie von Selinus, Gött. Ges. d. Wiss. 1865 ; Holm, Bull. d. comm. d. antich. di Sic., No. 4, Pal. 1871 ; Benndorf, Die Metopen von Selinunt, Berl. 1873.—For Acragas, Siefert, Akragas und sein Gebiet, Hamb. 1845 ; Schubring, Histor. Topographie von Akragas, Lpz. 1870.

43. For Massalia, Arist. fr. 239 ; Just. 43, 3 ; Thuc. 1, 13 ; Herod. 1, 165, 166, according to which the founding of Alalia took place some twenty-five years before the naval battle ; for five years the fugitive Phocaeans lived in Alalia. An earlier Phoenician settlement perhaps on the site of Massalia, Johannsen, vet. Massiliae res, Kiel, 1818 ; Bruckner und Ternaux, Hist. reip. Massil. Gött. 1826 ; Cless in Pauly's R. Enc. IV. ; Geisow, De Mass. rep. Bonn, 1865 ; Müllenhoff, Deutsche Alterthumskunde, 1, 177 seq. ; Zorn, Niederlass. der Phok. an der Südküste von Gallien, Kattowitz, 1879 ; also Busolt, Gr. G. I. 285 seq. and Meltzer, Gesch. d. Karthager, p. 163.—For Elea, Münter, Velia in Lucanien, Alt. 1818 ; F. Lenormant, A travers l'Apulie et la Lucanie, 2, 289 seq. Lenormant is the first writer who has investigated and described the ruins of Velia from the standpoint of our present knowledge, although in a somewhat cursory manner. W. Schleuning's account is now the best, Velia in Lukanien, Jahrb. des arch. Instituts, IV. 3.

44. For Cyrene, Herod. 4, 145-167 ; Schol. Pind. Pyth. 4, 10 ; Euseb. Cf. Thrige, Historia Cyrenes, 2nd ed., Kopenh. 1828 ; Barth, Wanderungen durch die Küstenländer des Mittelmeeres, Berl. 1849 ; Smith and Porcher, History of the recent discoveries at Cyrene, Lond. 1864 ; the notes of Stein on Herod. ; Duncker, 6, 260 seq., as also the remarks on the legends and date of the founding of the city in Busolt, Gr. G. I. 343 seq. ; Studniczka, Kyrene, Lpz. 1889. For the coins—L. Müller, Numismatique de l'ancienne Afrique, 1, Copenh. 1860. The chief product of Cyrene

was the Silphion, represented on the coins (besides a famous picture on a vase representing Arcesilaus superintending the weighing of the Silphion, Mon. d. Inst. T. tav. 47), which yielded a medicine much valued in antiquity ; it was a species of umbelliferous plant not yet exactly identified. Friendship between Cyrene and Samos, Herod. 4, 152. Alliance between Cyrene and Samos proved from the coins, Head, Hist. Num. p. 727. We also find on the coins the head of Zeus Ammon with ram's horns, the chief deity of Cyrene, who, although a native of Thebes in Egypt, came from there to the Oasis of Siwa as an oracular deity, and thence to Cyrene. Cf. E. Meyer in Roscher's Lex. 283 seq. The Lacedaemonian Dorieus failed in his attempt to take possession of the district of Tripolis (on the Kinyps, and praised by Herod. 4, 198 as the most fertile territory of the whole of Libya) at the end of the sixth century B.C.

CHAPTER XXII

CORINTH, SICYON AND MEGARA UNDER THE TYRANTS

We now leave our narrative of the expansion of the Greeks and return to their achievements in their hereditary or adopted homes. The Greeks were a nation of citizens. What each individual did, he did as a member of a civic community; hence the importance of their political life, to which all their intellectual energy was devoted. This does not preclude the gradual appearance of tendencies of a more universal kind, which manifest themselves at first in isolated branches of their literature, and afterwards take a scientific and finally a practical form. But the destinies of the Greeks are also shaped by the condition and the circumstances of the nations with whom they came in contact. And these three factors—home politics, intellectual aspirations and foreign influence—are often interwoven. In the preceding chapter we discussed events which had their beginning about the middle of the eighth century and extended over two centuries. In turning our attention to the internal politics of important Greek states, we have to deal with the larger portion of a period which begins about 650 and extends beyond 500 B.C., and in the middle of this period we have to take into consideration the influence of powerful foreign states upon Greece, an influence which was destined to continue. We shall treat the history of this period, up to the beginning of the Persian wars, in the following order:—first, we take

the tyrants of central Greece, next the changes brought about in the east by events in Asia Minor, then the civilization and internal development of Magna Graecia, and finally the history of Athens from its commencement to the beginning of the Persian wars.

The centre of the *tyrannis* in Greece was the country round the Isthmus, an ancient Ionic district which had been the most affected by the stream of traffic which flowed from east to west. Although the tyranny of the Orthagoridae in Sicyon may have been founded at an earlier date than that of the Cypselidae at Corinth, yet Corinth and the Cypselidae were of greater importance to the Greek world at large, and ought on that account to be mentioned first.[1]

We are already aware of the important position held by Corinth in the commerce of early times. The summit of the Acrocorinthus, some 1800 feet in elevation, which is rendered almost impregnable by reason of the spring of Peirene (said to have been created by a blow from the hoof of Pegasus), commanded the communications between central and southern Greece and between the Saronic and Corinthian Gulfs. Corinth was for a time the most important commercial city of Greece. In manufactures also, as we have seen, she ranked before all the Greek states. We have already referred to the most important of her colonies, and have mentioned her rivalry with Corcyra, and the naval action fought by them. Soon after the defeat of Corinth the aristocratic rule of the Bacchiadae was overthrown by the bold and wily Cypselus.[2]

The remarkable good fortune which attended him and his successor explains the circulation of legends concerning his extraction. A Bacchiad, named Amphion, had a daughter Labda, who was married to Aetion, a successor of the Lapith Caineus. The Pythia prophesied of the son of Labda and Aetion that he would become powerful in Corinth. For this reason the Bacchiadae plotted to kill him, but those entrusted with the deed were seized with compassion for the child, and

by the time they had decided to commit the murder his mother had concealed him in a chest, and in this way he was saved. Cypselus—for this name, meaning "chest," was given him by his father on account of his preservation—gained the chief power at Corinth as a popular leader about 657 B.C. Most of the Bacchiadae appear to have been banished. Some of them withdrew to Sparta. The wealthy Demaratus, as the legend runs, went to Etruria; his son, Tarquinius Priscus, became king of Rome. Many of the Bacchiadae fled to Corcyra, and one of them is said to have been the progenitor of the royal house of the Lyncestes on Mount Pindus. Cypselus endeavoured to compensate his state for its loss of influence in Corcyra by creating new connections in the west, and founded the colonies of Ambracia, Anactorium and Leucas.[3] The extension of the power of Corinth was an inducement to the Corcyraeans to do the like themselves. To the north of the Acroceraunian promontory and the mouth of the Aous they founded in conjunction with the Corinthians the town of Apollonia (seaport Aulon), and still farther north, Epidamnus, near the Illyrian town of Dyrrachium (the modern Durazzo), which subsequently superseded the Greek name.

The rule of Cypselus was a brilliant and, it is said, a cruel one. Fiscal measures, some of them of a legendary character, were ascribed to him. It was of course natural that the aristocracy should present his government in an unfavourable light. His religious foundations at the two centres of Greek worship, Delphi and Olympia, were famous. At Delphi he erected a special building for the reception of Corinthian offerings, probably the first of that series of treasure-houses which adorned the sacred precinct. To Olympia he sent a colossal golden statue of Zeus, which was erected near the temple of Hera, and was regarded as one of the greatest marvels of art even in later times.

Cypselus was succeeded as tyrant of Corinth by his eldest son Periander[4] (625 B.C.), who followed with distinction in his

father's footsteps, and achieved great reputation as a statesman and a promoter of culture. He succeeded in an important political undertaking by subjugating Corcyra, where he installed his son Nicolaus as viceroy. He turned his attention also to the east, and sent a band of colonists under his son Evagoras to one of the Chalcidian promontories, Pallene, where they founded Potidaea, which soon became the most important Greek city of that district. Whilst the worship of Apollo predominated among the Corinthian colonies of the west, the name of this city pointed to the cult of Poseidon; the isthmus on which Potidaea lay may have reminded the colonists of that at Corinth. In the immediate neighbourhood of Corinth, Periander extended his sway by the subjugation of Epidaurus, where his father-in-law, Procles, had ruled. Aegina, which was originally a dependency of Epidaurus, may have come under the rule of Corinth in this manner. The fame of Periander extended far and wide. Athens and Mitylene selected him as arbitrator in an important matter. The Athenians had taken possession of Sigeium at the entrance of the Hellespont; the Mityleneans, whose influence predominated in the Troad, endeavoured to expel them, and built the fortress of Achilleium, close to Sigeium. They made war on each other without decisive result. Thereupon Pittacus, the most influential man at Mitylene, and the Athenians agreed to refer the matter to the decision of Periander (after 600 B.C.) He decided in favour of the *status quo*, and the Athenians retained Sigeium, and the Mityleneans Achilleium. Periander also had friendly relations with Thrasybulus, tyrant of Miletus, and, according to the legend, informed him of an oracular utterance which had been conveyed to Alyattes, who was at war with Miletus, which enabled Thrasybulus to outwit the Lydians and save Miletus. Periander's relations extended even as far as Egypt, as is shown by the fact that his nephew bore the name of Psammetichus. He also wished to immortalize himself by works of art. He, or the Cypselidae according to

Pausanias, sent a finely-worked chest to Olympia, with reliefs representing scenes from the heroic legends; it was called the chest of Cypselus, and was supposed to be that in which his father had been saved.

Periander must have greatly increased the religious prestige of Corinth, if, as many think, the revival of the Isthmian games is to be attributed to him; but there is no doubt that he promoted another worship, that of Dionysus. In this he was assisted by a great artist, Arion of Methymna, who, as the successor of Terpander of Antissa, had acquired reputation as a citharoedist and composed choral odes. Hymns to Dionysus, called dithyrambs, had long been sung in the islands of the Aegean. Arion gave them the strict form of a choral ode, the several strophes of which were performed by divisions of the chorus standing round the altar of the god. Arion, however, is less famous for his works, which are lost to us, than for his preservation from death; for when he was thrown into the sea by sailors on the voyage from Tarentum to Corinth, a dolphin saved him and brought him to Cape Taenarum. His thank-offering erected on the spot, a man sitting on a dolphin, served to commemorate the miracle. The dolphins sporting in the sea were sacred to Apollo. A man riding upon a dolphin appears on the coins of Tarentum and Methymna, there called Taras; we can see how the legend of Arion may have originated.

The character of Periander's rule is illustrated, as is the case with most of the tyrants, by a number of more or less apocryphal anecdotes. Executions, a numerous body-guard, seizure of women's ornaments, belong to this class of stories. Others represent him as a ruler of extremely moral tendencies. He imposed no taxes, had procuresses thrown into the sea, forbade the purchase of slaves and prohibited luxury, tolerated no laziness, and would not even allow the citizens of Corinth to spend more than their incomes. If we bear in mind that an ancient tradition places Periander with Solon and Pittacus

among the Seven Sages, we may perhaps conclude that the tyrant of Corinth was remarkable, not only for his power at home and influence abroad, but also for a certain originality in his mode of government, and that he really was able to make the Corinthian citizens happy in his own way; but how much of these evidently exaggerated stories is true, no one can say.[5]

A vein of seriousness pervades the character and career of Periander, and in the legends about the close of his life it develops into melancholy. He killed his wife Melissa. Her father Procles informed his grandsons of it, and thereupon the second, Lycophron—the eldest Cypselus was weak in intellect—conceived an unsurmountable aversion to Periander, who at first treated him harshly, then sent him to Corcyra, and at last nominated him as his successor; but the youth was murdered by the Corcyraeans. As a punishment 300 Corcyraean youths were sent to Lydia, but they were set free at Samos on the way there. Nicolaus of Damascus has preserved the legends for us, according to which Periander lived to see the death of all his sons, his nephew Psammetichus thus becoming his successor. Loneliness in his own home, uncertainty regarding the issue of the work he had undertaken, perhaps remorse for many unjustifiable actions, these are the traits which characterize the closing scenes of the life of a much-envied monarch. Psammetichus reigned only three years, and was then murdered by some Corinthians. Psammetichus' brother Periander, who became ruler in Ambracia, was also overthrown.

As an immediate consequence of the fall of the tyranny the power of Corinth declined, especially in the west, where Corcyra again became independent, while in the east Potidaea remained dependent. The Corinthian aristocracy, however, appears to have ruled wisely. They joined the Spartan alliance, without however subordinating their interests altogether to those of Sparta; they even endeavoured to promote the rise of Athens by way of counterpoise.

In spite of the long succession of kings given to it by the chronologists, Sicyon was never able to rival Corinth in importance; the position of the city was sufficient to preclude this. The situation was however healthy and secure; it was built upon a high terrace between the river Asopus, so famous in legend, and the stream of Helisson. The Dorian conquerors, in organizing the community, had in addition to the three Phylae, Hyllees, Dymanates and Pamphyli, admitted a fourth, that of the Aegialii, which evidently contained the descendants of the original Ionic population of the country.[6] At a time when discontent with the nobles prevailed everywhere, an Aegialian, named Orthagoras, succeeded in overthrowing the rule of the nobility, and making himself tyrant, about 665 B.C.[7] He was succeeded by his son Myron, who in 648 B.C. was victor in the chariot-race at Olympia, and to commemorate his victory erected a treasure-house for himself in the Altis, which, according to Pausanias, contained two chambers of bronze, the one ornamented in the Doric, the other in the Ionic style.[8] The order of succession of the next occupants of the Sicyonian throne is not known for certain. The most important prince of this family was Cleisthenes, whose reign probably began about 596.[9] He was an enterprising and energetic man, and soon found an opportunity of showing his power. The Delphians had complained to the Amphictyonic Council of the acts of violence committed by the Crisaeans against the pilgrims to Delphi. The Athenians, whose representative was Solon, brought forward a motion for the protection of Delphi. Besides Athens, Sicyon was ready to intervene, as were also the Thessalians. The valour of the allies was not sufficient to bring the war to a successful issue, so they had recourse to a measure which was generally prohibited, and cut off the enemy's water-supply. The war was carried on about the year 590 B.C. The territory of Crisa was consecrated to Apollo, Artemis, Leto, and Athene Pronoia, and thus the Delphic priests succeeded in forming an ecclesi-

astical state under the protection of international law. Cleisthenes applied his share of the booty in erecting buildings and statues in Sicyon, which from that time began to be of importance in the history of Greek art.

The tyrant was animated with the ambition of making his own small city a rival of Argos, which was at the head of the Dorians in the north-east of the Peloponnese. In accordance with the Greek custom of justifying the present by the legends of the past, the Argives took their stand on the story of Adrastus having ruled over Sicyon when he was king of Argos. In reply to this Cleisthenes might have shown that Adrastus had really conquered Argos when he was lord of Sicyon,—an assertion which would have been quite as easy of proof as any other of a similar kind,—but such a learned mode of proceeding was not striking enough for him, and he preferred to deprive Adrastus altogether of his position as Sicyonian hero. He sounded the Pythia on the point, but without success. Thereupon he hit upon a method as practical as it was original. He begged the Thebans to cede to him the hero Melanippus, who had been one of the bravest defenders of Thebes against Adrastus. The Thebans felt flattered and granted his request. Cleisthenes then erected a shrine to Melanippus in the Prytaneum at Sicyon, and decreed to him part of the honours formerly shown to Adrastus; Dionysus was substituted for Adrastus in the choral songs. He did not however rest satisfied with this proof of originality. He altered, as Herodotus relates, the names of the four Phylae of the Sicyonians by turning the three Doric terms into nicknames, while he gave his own Phyle an honourable appellation. This was now called Archelaoi or rulers of the people; the Hyllees became Hyatae, or piglings; the Dymanates, Choreatae or porkers; the Pamphyli, Oneatae or young asses. Herodotus does not say that the three disgraced Phylae lost all their political influence, but some diminution of civic rights must have

accompanied the degradation. The new names lasted for sixty years after the death of Cleisthenes.

Cleisthenes appears to have had no sons, and but one daughter, Agariste. He sought a distinguished son-in-law, and as his wealth was well known, there was no lack of noble suitors for her. After he had won the chariot-race at Olympia, we do not know when, he invited them to come to Sicyon. The following made their appearance: Smindyridas from Sybaris, the most luxurious of men; Damasus from Siris, son of the wise Amyris; Amphimnestus from Epidamnus; Males from Aetolia, brother of the famous athlete Titormus; Amiantus from Trapezus in Arcadia; Laphanes from Azania; Onomastus from Elis; Leocedes, son of Pheidon, from Argos; the Scopad Diactorides from Crannon in Thessaly; Alcon from the country of the Molossians; Lysanias from Eretria; and finally two noble youths from Athens, the Philaid Hippocleides and the Alcmaeonid Megacles. Cleisthenes was best pleased with the two Athenians, and, as it appears, most of all with Hippocleides. But on the day fixed for the choice matters took another turn. A banquet was given at which the suitors endeavoured to display their social qualities. Hippocleides showed great skill in dancing. Cleisthenes thought this rather a dubious accomplishment, but when he stood on his head upon the table and clapped his legs in the air, Cleisthenes had had enough and declared in favour of Megacles. Thereupon Hippocleides said: "Hippocleides doesn't care," which passed into a proverb. The rejected suitors each received a talent.

Cleisthenes is a character, but quite different to Periander. Periander is the melancholy and Cleisthenes the jovial tyrant. Cleisthenes is the man who is always sure of himself, who surveys his fellow-men and cuts his joke over them, and over the gods as well. Adrastus has to disappear by one door, when his deadly enemy Melanippus comes in at the other, while a noble of ancient lineage has to submit to the official

appellation of sucking-pig. The *dénoûment* of the story of the suitors is no doubt inspired by the idea that Cleisthenes laid a trap for Hippocleides, into which the latter promptly fell. The descendants of the chosen son-in-law showed the same cunning in dealing with men as Cleisthenes of Sicyon. It is plain that Cleisthenes must have ruled in an intelligent manner, otherwise his reforms would not have lasted so long. When they were finally abolished, Sicyon became a dependency of Sparta.[10]

Of the other tyrants of the north-east of the Peloponnese we are already acquainted with Procles of Epidaurus, the father-in-law of Periander, and son-in-law of the aristocrat of Orchomenus, whom the Arcadians killed for his traitorous dealings with the Messenians. The tyrant of Megara, Theagenes, was far more powerful than Procles. Megara lay about a mile and a half from the sea, at the foot of two mountain fortresses separated by a depression, the easternmost of which was called Caria; it was an enterprising commercial town, and, as we have seen, the parent of important colonies. It was probably not long after the colonization of Selinus (628) that Theagenes made himself master of the government with the aid of the lower classes.[11] Little is known of what he did to the city itself; Pausanias speaks with admiration of a fine aqueduct, which was his work. But he was involved in the disturbances which occupied Athens. His son-in-law was Cylon, whose attempt to make himself tyrant of Athens we shall come to presently. The failure of this undertaking resulted in a war between Megara and Athens, and Theagenes was banished. Little definite is known of the history of Megara in the ensuing years of the sixth century. An episode of its foreign history has been narrated above (Ch. XXI.). Its internal history was marked by a revolution, in which the demos overthrew the aristocracy. But the former abused their power by acts of violence, and were soon overthrown, and the aristocracy once more came to the front.

But, if we are to credit the verses of Theognis, it lost its exclusive character and made common cause with the people. Theognis, whose elegiac verses are our source of information for these incidents, is one of the most remarkable figures in the history of Greek civilization. He was a nobleman, and in his elegiacs, a form of poetry specially cultivated by the partisans of intellectual progress, he gives acute and witty expression to a thoroughly exclusive caste-feeling.[12]

NOTES

1. The character of the tyrannies in the three cities has been carefully estimated by Busolt, Die Lakedaimonier, I. It is specially in the case of the tyrants that we find favourable and unfavourable currents of opinion in the authorities, the exaggerations of which can more easily be felt than proved.

2. For the Corinthian tyranny cf. Wilisch, Beiträge zur innere Geschichte des alten Korinth, Zittau, 1887; Knapp, Die Kypseliden, Tüb. 1888. In the original authorities we find two distinct traditions, one represented by Herodotus, and the other by Nicolaus of Damascus. For Cypselus, Herod. 5, 92; Ar. Pol. 5, 9, 22; Nic. Dam. fr. 58 (Müll. III.); I. Schubring, De Cypselo, Gött. 1862. For the banishment of the Bacchiadae, Polyaen. 5, 31, 1; Plat. Lys. 1; D. Hal. 3, 35; Liv. 1, 32. The duration of the rule of the Cypselidae acc. to Ar. Pol. 5, 9, 22, was seventy-three and a half years, of which Cypselus, acc. to Aristotle, reigned thirty years. Periander, acc. to Diog. L. 1, 98, reigned forty years; cf. the detailed criticism of Busolt, G. G. 1, 446, who makes 657 the first year of the Cypselid dynasty.

3. The colonies of Ambracia, Leucas and Anactorium were founded in the time of Cypselus, Strabo, 7, 352; 10, 452; Scymn. 454. Periander is mentioned in connection with Apollonia, Anactorium and Leucas by Plut. Ser. num. vind. 7, but he does not exactly say that Periander founded them. For Epidamnus and Apollonia, Thuc. 1, 24; Strabo, 7, 316. Participation oi the Corcyraeans in the founding of Anactorium and Leucas, Thuc. 1, 55; Plut. Them. 24.—The coins show that Leucas, Anactorium and Ambracia were connected with Corinth, Apollonia and Epidamnus on the other hand with Corcyra, and consequently with

Eretria and Carystus; cf. Percy Gardner, Types, pp. 39, 40. Acc. to Strab. 8, 357, the inhabitants of Dyspontium who were hostile to the Eleans went to Epidamnus and Apollonia. Curtius, Studien zur Gesch. von Korinth, Hermes, Vol. X. has pointed out that the Corinthian tyrants united the colonies of that city into a kind of confederated empire.

4. For Periander, Herod. 3, 47-54; Ar. Pol. 3, 8, 3; 5, 8, and 9; Eph. fr. 106; Heracl. Pont. fr. 5; Nic. Dam. fr. 59 (Müll. III.), where the moral government of the tyrant is emphasized. Founding of Potidaea under Periander, N. Dam. fr. 60. Cf. the same reference for an account of the family of Periander, differing in many details of facts and names from the accounts in Herod. 3, 50, and Diog. L. 1, 94. The chest of Cypselus, Paus. 5, 17-19. For Periander cf. Wagner, De Periandro, Darmst. 1831; Holle, De Per., München, 1869; Busolt, Die Lakedaim., p. 205 seq. For Arion, Herod. 1, 23; Suid. s. v. Ἀρίων, Gell. 16, 19; Ael. V. H. 12, 45. The improbability of the various legends about the later years of Periander demonstrated by Duncker, 6, 67: Curtius in his Gr. Gesch. has well described the misery of his concluding years. Fall of the tyranny in Corinth, Nic. Dam. fr. 60. There is no record of Sparta's participation in the overthrow of the tyranny in Corinth, etc., as Busolt has exhaustively proved.

5. Encouragement of virtue and economy by a tyrant, who at the same time patronizes the worship of Dionysus, is unintelligible to me. If he really had procuresses thrown into the sea, his object was to prevent the official attendants of the Corinthian goddess from being injured in their business by private competition. In the same way certain states prohibit private lotteries, not on moral grounds, but because they wish to make a profit themselves out of the gambling propensities of the people.

6. Herod. 5, 68 does not expressly state that the Phyle of the Aegialeans was ancient Ionic, but its name and the context seem to prove it.

7. Acc. to Arist. Pol. 5, 9, 21, the tyranny of the Orthagoridae lasted 100 years. Acc. to Diod. fr. 8, 24, Dind., the founder of the tyranny in Sicyon was probably the cook Andreas; Orthagoras is called a cook by Libanius κατὰ Σεβήρου, p. 251, Reiske; hence Orthagoras is considered to be another name of Andreas. The order of succession of the Orthagoridae is not known for certain; cf. the ingenious conjectures of Duncker, 6, 78. Acc. to Paus. 6, 19, 1, 2, Myron was visitor at Olympia in the 33rd Olympiad, *i.e.* 648 B.C.

8. The excavations at Olympia have proved the treasure-house itself to be of Dorian architecture. The chambers—θάλαμοι—

must therefore have been smaller erections inside the treasure-house, not parts of it, as has hitherto been supposed.

9. For Cleisthenes cf. Herod. 5, 67, 68. Homer, *i.e.* the Epos, was not allowed to be recited in Sicyon, because he always spoke of Argos and the Argives. For the manner in which Cleisthenes became tyrant, Nic. Dam. fr. 61 (Müll. III.); Herod. 6, 126-130, relates the story of the marriage of Agariste, concerning which, as well as on the other questions connected with Cleisthenes, F. Zühlke has written, De Agaristiis nuptiis, Insterb. 1880. The date of Cleisthenes is determined by his having taken part in the first Sacred War, and having been victor in the Pythian games in 582, Paus. 10, 7, 3. We may assume that Megacles married Agariste a little before 570. There is nothing to vouch for the correctness of the names of the suitors; from what is known from other sources of some of them, it is almost impossible that they should have been suitors for the hand of Agariste about the year 570. It is not, however, improbable that Hippocleides was among them. The choice lay between him and Megacles; the names of the others could be invented at pleasure. We believe that the story has a substratum of fact; a gathering of suitors has nothing improbable in it. The fact that among the Greek states, from which the suitors came, we find none belonging to the group of Samos, Chalcis, etc., but only those belonging to the hostile group of Eretria, Miletus, etc., as I have noticed in my treatise "Lange Fehde" (Epidamnus also belonged to the latter group), appears to me to prove that the story contains some elements of truth. It gives a good picture of the manners of the time, but must be taken with the humour in which it is related. It forms a cheerful contrast to the stories of suitors in the old legends, which end in murder and war, the suitors of Helen and those of Penelope.—Duncker, 6, 88, 89, neatly conjectures that the Argives indemnified Adrastus for his deposition in Sicyon at the Nemean Games. The preference given to the worship of Dionysus is noteworthy as a point of similarity with Periander. A peculiar measure of Cleisthenes (which has recently been proved to be extremely probable) was the revision of the list of ancient Sicyonian kings, from which he struck out the rulers who did not fit in with the theory of an independent Sicyon. Another instance of the manufacture of history! Cf. Busolt, G. G. 1, 469.

10. The last tyrant was probably Aeschines, De malign. Herod. 21.

11. For Theagenes, Ar. Pol. 5, 4, 5; Thuc. 1, 126; Paus. 1, 28, 1; 1, 40, 1; 1, 41, 2; Plut. Qu. Gr. 18. Cf. Plass, I. 176, 177; Busolt, G. G. 1, 497 seq.

12. Cf. esp. Welcker's edition of Theognis : Theog. Reliquiae, Francof. 1826, especially Die Prolegomena ; recently, among others, Busolt, Die Lakedaimonier, 1, 236-44 and 284-294, as well as the detailed description of Megarian affairs founded on the verses of Theognis in Duncker, 6, 428 seq. Cf. F. Caner, Parteien und Politiker in Megara und Athen, Tüb. 1890.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE GREEKS OF ASIA MINOR IN CONFLICT WITH LYDIA AND PERSIA

On the soil of Asia Minor the Greeks had produced the first-fruits of a civilization which had been hindered in its development in European Greece by the Dorian invasion. Their spirit of enterprise had led them on distant trading voyages, the result of which was the establishment of new communities on remote shores. Thus the Greek name became known in the farthest corners of the Black Sea, and on the coasts of Libya and Italy. But the founders of many of these colonies, the Greeks of Asia Minor, were by no means in a favourable position as regards the security of their national existence. They inhabited the fringe of a continent, the interior of which was occupied by vast empires, which far surpassed Greece in material power, and were besides able to boast of the possession of an older and in many respects more highly-developed civilization. That the Greeks maintained their independence for so long a period was due to various external circumstances, which afterwards underwent a change, and mainly to the fact that the continental empires set no particular value on the coast-line. Thus they had in former years left the Carians and other settlers on the coast in peace. But a change gradually took place. In the interior, and not very far from the coast, there arose an empire, the rulers of which set great store on having access to the sea, and saw in the growing

wealth of the Greek seaports an incentive to obtaining possession of them. Of the two nations of central Asia Minor west of the river Halys, the Phrygians and the Lydians, the latter showed more enterprise and desire for commercial profit, and displayed a tendency to extend their sphere of influence beyond its original boundaries. For a long time the two kingdoms existed side by side until, probably towards the close of the seventh century, Phrygia was absorbed by Lydia. In religion and civilization there was no absolute contrast between them and Greece. Gordius and Midas almost belong to Greece, while the Ephesian Artemis as well as the Amazons were completely adopted by the Greek religion; in the legend Pelops is scarcely regarded as a stranger; and in the seventh century B.C. there dwelt at Sparta the lyric poet Alcman, who was born in Sardis and came originally to Sparta as a slave, which did not, however, prevent him from boasting of having come from "lofty" Sardis and loudly asserting that he was no Thessalian or Acarnanian, as though a Lydian were better suited for the foremost state of Greece than they were. It was a strange coincidence that the most active section of the Greeks in Asia Minor should be neighbours of the most enterprising people of the interior, and should mutually influence each other. The Aeolians in the north and the Dorians in the south were placed at the corners of the great continent, and so less exposed to the attacks of the inhabitants of the interior; the Ionians on the other hand lived near the mouths of the Hermus, the Cayster and the Maeander, which flowed from Lydia and made the inhabitants of their upper valleys inclined to take an interest in the peoples of Phocaea, Smyrna, Ephesus and Miletus. A quarrel was bound to break out between the Ionians and the Lydians as soon as the latter felt themselves to be the stronger of the two.

This took place under the dynasty which, according to the legend, was the third that ruled over this people. The

Atyadae were succeeded by the Heraclidae. The latter are known by all kinds of legends. King Adyattes was succeeded by his sons Cadys and Ardys, of whom the former died early, and the latter was banished and lived at Cyme as a wheelwright until he was restored to the throne of his fathers. Sadyattes, son of Ardys, had secretly made away with a nobleman, the Mermnad Dascylus: during the reign of Sadyattes, called Candaules by Herodotus, who after Meles and Myrsus was the last Lydian king of the house of the Heraclidae, Gyges, the grandson of the murdered Dascylus, returned from exile, and became powerful and respected about the court. He, however, murdered Sadyattes, and made himself ruler of the people.[1] The Mermnadae, who thus ascended the throne, were an important princely family of the country, who had evidently been compelled to take refuge for a time from persecution by residence abroad. The revolution, however, does not appear to have gone off quite smoothly. All the Lydians were not ready to let their old dynasty disappear without a struggle. Recourse was had to the Delphic oracle, which declared in favour of Gyges. The rich presents sent by Gyges—Herodotus mentions six golden mixing-bowls of thirty talents weight — were probably promised beforehand and no doubt gratefully accepted.

Gyges determined to bring the natural seaports of his country into his own power. The Greeks resisted, but without sufficient energy. They were not united by any political tie, neither those who lived on the coast of Asia Minor, nor even the members of the same clan. Gyges first, as it appears, attacked Magnesia, which, like Sardis itself, lay in the valley of the Hermus, on the northern slopes of Mount Sipylus, nearer to the sea than the capital of Lydia, but far enough from it to be regarded as an inland city.[2] Thus the supplies of the place might be cut off, and this was probably the method adopted by Gyges to subdue it. With Smyrna he was less successful. The Smyrnaeans were defeated in battle

and the Lydians pursued them into the city, but were driven out again. Gyges also tried his strength against Miletus, but in vain; he however subdued Colophon. It was said that he conquered the town, and, therefore, perhaps not the citadel, and the Lydians are reported to have concluded an alliance with the Colophonians; this probably means that Gyges abated his claims, and that the citizens in return accorded him certain advantages. On the whole the advance of the power of Lydia under Gyges is clear. But the close of his reign was unfortunate. He perished during an invasion of barbarians, the Cimmerians, who inhabited the north of the Black Sea, but had been driven from their homes by Scythians, and now poured over the countries lying to the south of that sea. From the confused records of the doings of this people, it seems that their invasion of the west of Asia about the middle of the seventh century was not the first, but that they had appeared in those parts before, and that their migration from their homes in the north belongs to the eighth century. The fate of Gyges in his struggle with the Cimmerians is known to us from documents of King Assurbanipal of Assyria, who reigned probably from 669 B.C. onwards. He relates that Gyges of Lydia, a country the name of which had never been heard before in Assyria, sent to do homage to him. Immediately afterwards the Lydian prince defeated the Cimmerians, two of whose leaders he sent bound in fetters to Nineveh. But Assurbanipal adds that Gyges did not preserve his submissive attitude towards Assyria, but on the contrary sent aid to Pisamilki (Psammetichus), who had rebelled against Assurbanipal in Egypt. Thereupon the king of Assyria prayed to his gods, Assur and Istar, that the body of Gyges might be thrown to his enemies. And so it happened, for the Cimmerians now defeated and killed him. The successor of Gyges, however, acknowledged the sovereignty of the king of Assyria. This version makes Gyges perish when fighting against the Cimmerians, who also burnt the temple of the

Ephesian Artemis. According to Herodotus, the Cimmerians poured into Lydia during the reign of his successor Ardys, took possession of Sardis, except the citadel, and plundered Ionic cities. Gradually their strength declined, and Ardys towards the close of his reign was not much troubled by them, nor was his successor Sadyattes, while the next king, Alyattes (610-561), completely crushed them.

We hear but little of the further relations of these Lydian kings with the Greek cities. According to Herodotus, Ardys attacked Miletus, but without success; on the other hand, he captured Priene. Sadyattes sent an expedition against Smyrna,[3] and endeavoured to take Miletus. At that time Thrasybulus was the tyrant of this city. Every year Sadyattes laid waste the district round the city, and the war was carried on by Alyattes in the same fashion. Only the Chians sided with the Milesians. At last matters came to a crisis in the following manner. Alyattes inadvertently burned a temple of Athene in Assesus near Miletus; he was obliged to rebuild it, and for that purpose required a truce. Periander informed Thrasybulus that Alyattes would ask for this truce, and Thrasybulus, when the messengers arrived, made his subjects feast and carouse in public, as though the war were causing them no anxiety. On hearing this Alyattes made peace and an alliance with the Milesians. He also occupied Smyrna and the luxurious Colophon.[4] Smyrna was too near to Sardis for her rivalry to be tolerated. According to Strabo, the Smyrnaeans lived for centuries afterwards in an unfortified town. He attacked Clazomenae, but sustained a severe defeat. The Lydians now possessed two good harbours in Smyrna and Colophon, while the alliance with Miletus placed that excellent seaport also at their disposal. He had no need to trouble himself about Ephesus. That city was on the friendliest terms with the Lydians, and was ruled by its own princes, who were related by marriage to the Mermnadae. In the north Lydia possessed Adramyttium and Dascylium.

Alyattes also made his kingdom more secure towards the east. In that direction the Assyrian empire had taken the place of that of the Medes and Babylonians. Alyattes came in conflict with the Medes, who at that time had repulsed an invasion of the Scythians, and were endeavouring to extend their boundaries towards the north-west. The war lasted several years; then a battle was fought, during which an eclipse of the sun occurred, which Thales was said to have predicted. This made the combatants, who both worshipped the god of light, pause to reflect. The king of Babylonia and Syennesis of Cilicia assumed the office of mediators, peace was concluded between Lydia and Media, and the river Halys fixed as the boundary line. The daughter of Alyattes married Astyages, son of Cyaxares.[5] As Alyattes also subdued the Carians, he became ruler of all the country west of the Halys and north of the Taurus. He accumulated great riches, which Croesus afterwards displayed to the whole world. The tomb of Alyattes, which has been described by Herodotus, long remained celebrated. He says it ranked next to the great monuments of the Egyptians and Babylonians. Its lower portions consisted of large blocks of stone, six stadia and two plethra (about 3800 ft.) in circumference, and its upper part of earth, which was piled up by merchants, shopkeepers, artizans, labourers, and prostitutes. Herodotus saw five stone pillars with inscriptions on the upper part stating how much each class of workers had performed, and the prostitutes had done the most. If this is true, the Lydians must have had a special reason for being satisfied with the state of their morals. The *tumuli* of the Lydian kings and nobles can still be seen to the north of Sardis, on the other side of the Hermus. The largest, which is over 3500 ft. in circumference, and about 230 ft. above the level of the plain, is evidently the tomb of Alyattes.

Alyattes was succeeded in the year 560[6] by his son Croesus, but not without opposition, for there was a party which favoured another son of Alyattes by a Greek mother, named

Pantaleon. Croesus was thirty-five years of age at his accession; his kingdom was prosperous, its finances in excellent order, and his army by no means to be despised. He determined to go on with the work begun by his ancestors, and to complete the subjugation of the Greek cities on the coast. United and energetic action on the part of these cities might have saved them, and frustrated the efforts of the Lydian monarch. But some were vacillating, and others cared little for independence. The Milesians clung to their separate alliance with Lydia; and Croesus proved to them that he venerated the Milesian Apollo quite as much as that of Delphi, for the gifts which he sent to Miletus equalled in value those sent to Delphi. Of the other cities Ephesus, whose prince had quarrelled with Croesus, was the most important, and it refused to surrender to the Lydians. Thereupon Croesus directed machines against the walls, a mode of attack rare in antiquity. A tower fell, and Ephesus was in danger of being taken. In this crisis the inhabitants conceived the happy idea of connecting the city walls by a long rope with the temple of Artemis, which stood at a distance of seven stades from the city. The effect of this was to extend the inviolability of the temple to the city, in other words, it was an appeal for milder terms, which Croesus granted them. He also presented to the temple the monolith columns which were still wanting, and offered gold to Artemis. The fall of Ephesus was followed by that of the rest of the Greek cities, including the Dorian and Aeolian. As a rule Croesus only demanded the payment of a yearly tribute. After the seaport towns had been taken, his intention was to attack the islands also, but, according to Herodotus, he was deterred from his plan by a conversation with the sage Bias. In reply to Croesus' question as to what was going on among the Greeks, Bias informed him that the inhabitants of the islands intended to collect a mounted force and march against Sardis. Croesus rejoined that he was glad to hear it, as then he would be

certain to conquer them. The islands would be just as glad, replied Bias, if Croesus were to attack them with a fleet, and thereupon the king abandoned his project.

Croesus wished to be on good terms with the Greeks, and showed this not only by leaving the cities on the coast unmolested in their internal affairs and not demanding troops from them, but also by taking every opportunity of honouring Greek sanctuaries and distinguished Greeks. The temples of Apollo in Miletus, Delphi and Thebes, and the shrine of Amphiaraus received gifts. The Spartans, who desired to consecrate a golden statue to Apollo upon Mount Thornax, were presented with the gold required for the purpose. To a Greek of Ephesus, who had made him a loan before his accession, he sent a cartload of gold. The Athenian Alcmaeon, who had entertained the ambassadors of Croesus on their journey to Delphi, received permission to take as much gold as he could carry from the royal treasury. Although he claimed descent from Nestor, he thought it not beneath his dignity to dress himself up in a broad coat and wide shoes like a Scythian, and to fill them with gold, to strew gold dust in his hair, and even to stuff gold into his mouth. Croesus was highly delighted, and gave the wag just as much again.[7] But no one inspired him with so much respect as the Athenian Solon, who, according to the ancient legend, visited Croesus at Sardis in the course of one of his journeys. Croesus, who wished to be praised by the wise man, asked him whom he considered to be the happiest of mankind. Solon named firstly one Tellus, an Athenian, who after an honourable life had died gloriously for his country; and secondly, the brothers Cleobis and Biton, who by their self-sacrifice had enabled their mother, a priestess, to fulfil her religious duties, and then died an easy death. When Croesus grew impatient and desired to know why he was not to be considered happy, Solon replied that wealth did not bring happiness nor the

want of it unhappiness, and that no man could be called happy until his death. This story exhibits the most prominent trait of the genuine Greek character, which rejects everything excessive, and was more strongly marked in the Athenians than in all the rest of the Greeks, and in none more than in Solon.[8]

The easy lot of the Greek cities of Asia Minor under Lydian rule, which left them their municipal independence and greatly facilitated their trade with the interior, was not to last long. The Lydians had to yield to a more powerful foe. The Persians, like the chief tribes of the Medes, belonged to the Aryan race. While the latter had remained in the north round Ecbatana, the Persians had gone more south in the direction of the gulf which bears their name. Here they lived, as it appears, in two divisions under princes of the house of the Achaemenidae. The western branch had settled in a part of Elam and had there founded the kingdom of Ansan, of which Cyrus, son of Cambyses, was ruler. It was he who overthrew the sovereignty of the Median king Astyages. The Medes, originally of simple habits and robust physique, soon met the fate which no Oriental nation escapes, and which the Persians in their turn were about to experience — effeminacy bred of excess of power and wealth. In the East the ruder but more vigorous race soon breaks up the more civilized and more effeminate one. This the Medes suffered at the hands of the Persians. And there is another factor which makes itself felt in the East— the demoralizing influence of unwieldy and autocratically-governed empires. The combination of luxury and despotism ruins a people. Whether Cyrus was really related to Astyages, as the legend says, cannot now be ascertained; it is possible that the conquered Medes invented it to console themselves for their defeat by the Persians. That Cyrus was king of Ansan in Elam, has only lately been discovered from Babylonian inscriptions,[9] which have also

revealed the still more surprising fact that he cared little about the pure faith of the Iranians, which is attributed to the Persians of that period in general—for in Babylon he declared himself a worshipper of the native deities of that city.[10]

Two states, Babylon and Lydia, had specially to protect themselves against the new Persian empire, and were thus forced into an alliance with each other. In Babylon the famous and powerful Nabuchodonossor had been succeeded by unimportant and feeble princes, the last of whom was Nabunahid. But it was possible to draw Egypt into the combination, for Gyges had already made overtures to her, and at that moment her ruler was not a descendant of Psammetichus, but the usurper Amasis, who had embraced Greek civilization even more warmly than his predecessors. Croesus, however, thought best to make the venture alone. According to the legend related by Herodotus, he first sought favourable omens for his undertaking in Greece; having tested the oracles and ascertained that Delphi alone knew what was going on at a distance, he placed his confidence in this oracle with regard to the future. He was told that if he crossed the Halys he would destroy a great empire, and this he supposed referred to Persia, especially as another oracle bade him have no fear of the Medes until they had a mule for their king, a thing which he believed would never happen. The oracle also advised him to make the most powerful of the Hellenes his allies.[11] Croesus concluded that these were the Spartans, as was in fact the case, and made an alliance with them. After this he crossed the Halys with his army, which consisted mostly of mercenaries, took Pterii and invaded Cappadocia, where Cyrus met him. The battle was undecisive(?), whereupon Croesus considered it better policy to postpone the continuation of the war until the next year, when he could meet the Persians with a more numerous army. He returned to Sardis and appealed for aid to Amasis of Egypt, to the Babylonian King Nabunahid

(Labynetus), and to the Lacedemonians, and was foolish enough to disband his mercenaries, imagining that Cyrus would also wait till the spring. Cyrus, however, made a rapid march on Sardis, and Croesus had to resist the attack with a handful of troops. According to the legend, Cyrus won the battle chiefly by means of a stratagem. Knowing that horses dislike the smell of camels, he placed camel-riders in front of his army, and the Lydian horses took to flight. The Lydians sprang to the ground and continued the struggle bravely, but the Persians won the day and Croesus was besieged in the citadel. After a short defence it was captured, and Croesus, whose life had been saved from a Persian by a sudden cry of his son, who had hitherto been dumb, was made prisoner. He was on the point of being burned when he remembered his interview with Solon and called out his name. He had to relate what Solon had told him, whereupon Cyrus, considering the instability of all human greatness, gave orders for his life to be spared. But the flames had mounted too high to be extinguished, and Croesus would have been burned had not Apollo, in answer to his cries, sent rain and put out the fire (546 B.C.). After this, Croesus stood in high favour with Cyrus. He reproached the Delphic oracle for its deceitfulness, but the god maintained that he had on the contrary delayed his fall for three years and saved his life upon the pyre; that, moreover, Croesus had failed to understand the oracle about the mule, for Cyrus, being half Mede and half Persian, was the mule; and that he had misinterpreted the oracle about the crossing of the Halys, for he had in fact destroyed a great empire. This was adding insult to injury, but Herodotus says that Croesus recognized the justice of the rebuke.[12]

After the kingdom of Lydia it was the turn of the Greeks on the coast to be subdued.[13] They had not given proof of the insight which the crisis demanded. They were subjects of Croesus, but not liable to military service. Cyrus

had invited them to make an alliance with him against Croesus. This they declined, and properly so, for they could hardly expect any improvement of their on the whole easy position from a prince who looked round so far for allies, and was, moreover, an ambitious conqueror. Then Croesus asked them to render him assistance, and this they should have done. They might have delayed the fall of Sardis, and perhaps help might have arrived from Egypt, Babylon and Sparta, and Lydia might have been saved to their advantage. They could not, however, make up their minds to take this step, and now they had to bear the penalty. After Cyrus' victory they came to the conclusion that they must do something, and they offered him their submission on the terms which they had enjoyed under Croesus, that is, the payment of tribute. But this was not enough for Cyrus. He rejected their proposals, but made an exception in favour of Miletus, with which he renewed the treaty it formerly had with Croesus. The Milesians had long made up their minds, in the interests of their commerce, to have as little as possible to do with Asiatic politics. It was of no use to the rest of the Ionians that Aeolian ambassadors appeared at their festal assembly at Mycale, and declared that the Aeolians would follow wherever the Ionians would lead, for the latter did not know themselves where to turn. It was decided to fortify the cities—for in some cases they had been obliged to pull down their walls at the command of the Lydians, and in others the towns had extended beyond the ancient narrow limits—and to appeal to Sparta for aid against Persia. But the embassy of the Aeolian and Ionian cities, whose speaker, Pythermus of Phocaea, appeared in the Spartan assembly clad in a purple robe, accomplished nothing. The Spartans had intended to support Croesus, and their ships were ready to transport an army to Asia when the news of his fall arrived, and then all operations had been suspended. They might at this junc-

ture have rendered assistance to their Greek kinsmen, with a view to save them, but they were unwilling to make any sacrifice. Something, however, was attempted. A Spartan, by name Lacrines, proceeded in a fifty-oared galley to Phocaea and thence to Sardis, where Cyrus still remained, and required him in the name of Sparta not to injure any city on Hellenic soil, for Sparta would not tolerate it. Cyrus paid no heed to this, and the Spartans did not go beyond words. Cyrus could not himself complete the conquest of the west of Asia Minor, for difficulties in the interior called him away. He left behind the Persian Tabalus as governor of Lydia, but a Lydian named Pactyas as administrator of the revenues. The latter revolted and was joined by the Greeks, evidently because he had command of money. Cyrus sent Mazares to the assistance of Tabalus, who was besieged in the citadel of Sardis. The revolt was suppressed, and Pactyas fled to Cyme. The Milesian Apollo bade the Cymaeans surrender him, but they allowed him to escape to Mitylene, and thence to Chios. The Chians gave him up. Mazares now turned against the Greek cities. Priene was subdued first, and then Magnesia on the Maeander; the inhabitants of both cities were reduced to slavery. Mazares died soon after this, and Cyrus replaced him by the Mede Harpagus, whose first act was to make war on Phocaea. Phocaea was perhaps the most powerful city of the Ionians, at all events more energetic than Miletus, to which it was inferior in trade and culture. It had taken in hand the commerce with the Iberian Tartessus which had been opened up by the Samians. Arganthonius, king of Tartessus, who is said to have reigned eighty years, offered the Phocaeans, when they were pressed by the Persians, first a home in his own territory, and when they declined this, he sent them money to build new fortifications. Harpagus laid siege to Phocaea, and the new wall proved of no use. We may assume that he was on the point of taking the city when

he announced to the inhabitants that he was ready to withdraw if they would pull down a battlement and give up a house in the city as a token of submission. But the Phocaeans would not consent to this; they asked for a day's respite, during which Harpagus was to keep his army at a distance from the walls, and this was granted by Harpagus, although, as he said, he was perfectly well aware of their intentions. The Phocaeans embarked in haste, taking with them their treasures, and sailed to Chios, where they intended to buy the islands called Oenyssae, and settle there. But the Chians, fearing competition from such skilful merchants, refused. The Phocaeans then returned suddenly to Phocaea, cut down the Persian garrison, and, throwing a lump of iron into the sea, vowed that they would not return until it rose to the surface again, and then set sail for Corsica, where, twenty years before, they had founded the city of Alalia. Harpagus burned Phocaea to the ground and marched against Teos, which he took. The Teans fled to the Thracian coast and there founded Abdera. The other Ionian and Aeolian cities were conquered in like manner, and the inhabitants compelled to serve in the Persian army. It was now the turn of the Dorians. The Delphic oracle contributed to their subjection, perhaps because the Lydian gold was now in Persian hands. The Cnidans endeavoured to protect themselves by making their city into an island by means of a trench dug across the narrow isthmus. When, however, the work did not make good progress, and the Cnidans asked advice from Delphi, they received the answer that they ought neither to fortify nor dig through the isthmus, for Zeus would have made the place an island had he so wished it. The Cnidans then surrendered. In Caria the inhabitants of Pedasus made a vigorous but ineffectual resistance. The Lycians, who were always noted for their spirit of independence, made the bravest defence. When blockaded in Xanthus, they brought their women and

children and all their property into the citadel and set fire to them. They then hurled themselves against the enemy and perished to the last man. Thus Lycia also succumbed to the Persians. Even the Chians and Lesbians surrendered, in spite of their insular position which protected them from the attacks of the Persians, who were unprovided with ships, the reason evidently being their desire to preserve their property on the mainland.

Cyrus formed the subjugated districts and cities into two satrapies, one to the north-east embracing Phrygia with its capital at Dascylium near the Propontis, and the other to the south-west, including principally Lydia, with Sardis as capital. The Greek towns retained their independence in municipal affairs. They had to pay tribute as formerly to the Lydians, and provide troops and ships whenever the king required it. Their religious associations were not interfered with, for the Persians had every reason to be satisfied with the gods of the Greeks. Thus the Ionians were allowed to meet as before unmolested on Mount Mycale, and when they re-assembled there for the first time Bias proposed to them that they should all follow the example of the Phocaeans and Teans and emigrate, but in a more advantageous manner, by going in one body to Sardinia and founding a large city there.[14] The plan did not meet with approval, and would probably not have resulted in success. It would have been impossible to make so many individuals work harmoniously together, and besides Sardinia was not suitable for a settlement by reason of its climate. The Greeks remained in Asia, and did service to their own nation by upholding Greek civilization. The prospects of liberty were, it is true, not very bright in that part of the world, for Cyrus, in order to make his rule more secure, introduced a new system of government into the Greek cities, which greatly restricted the freedom of the citizens. He thought it unadvisable to keep governors at each place, for he wished to maintain the prosperity of the

cities, which could only be of service to him, and any over-restraint on the part of foreign rulers would prejudicially affect the growth of their wealth. He preferred to rely upon natives who took the position of tyrants. It was consequently their interest to remain loyal to the Persians, to whom alone they owed their power. Cyrus' policy was justified by the event; the Greek cities remained loyal to Persia under their tyrants until other circumstances brought about revolts after the lapse of half a century. For a time the Persians were masters of the whole of Asia Minor. According to Herodotus, they broke the power of Lydia by refusing to allow the inhabitants to engage in manly pursuits and by accustoming them systematically to a life of luxury, a system adopted on the advice of Croesus himself, who wished in this way to save his people from slavery. It is plain, however, that whatever Cyrus may have done in this direction—and it was probably not much—it would not have succeeded so well, had not a love of luxury and money-making been deeply rooted in the Lydian character. That such was the case is shown by the invention of coins being ascribed to them, and by the story of the tomb of Alyattes.

NOTES

1. Herod. 1, 8 seq.; Nic. Dam. fr. 49 (M.), probably from Xanthus; Plut. Qu. Gr. 45. There is much disagreement among ancient authors with regard to the names and order of succession of the last Heraclidae. The story of the ring of Gyges in Plut. Rep. 2, 359, 10, 612 is quite fabulous.—R. Schubert, Geschichte der Könige von Lydien, 1884; and now esp. Radet, La Lydie, Paris, 1893. Chronology acc. to Xanthus and Herodotus probably as follows: accession of Gyges, 699; Alyattes III. (Ardys), 663; Sadyattes II., 625; Alyattes IV., 610; Croesus, 561-60.

2. For the expedition against Magnesia cf. Nic. Dam. fr. 62 (M.) It is true that Nic. Dam. does not expressly mention it as northern Magnesia. Modern writers consider the taking of Magnesia by Gyges to be a myth. For the history of Gyges, for the manner and cause of the rise of the Mermnadae and the chronology, cf.

Gelzer, Das Zeitalter des Gyges in the Rh. Mus. 30 and 35 ; and esp. Radet, La Lydie, pp. 151-186. Radet considers Gyges to be the inventor of coinage. His programme and that of his successors is, according to Radet, "alliance avec les Grecs d'Europe, protectorat sur les Grecs d'Asie." The leader of the Cimmerians in their last conquest was Lygdamis, a Carian if we may judge by his name, Radet, p. 180.—For an account of Assurbanipal, see Smith, History of Assurbanipal, p. 64 seq., and Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, 5, 2, 95 seq. Cf. generally the narrative of Meyer, G. d. A. § 452 seq. who also, with other writers, considers it probable that the Cimmerians did not come from the east to Asia Minor, but by way of Thrace, whence they took with them the Treres. Conquest of Sardis by the Cimmerians in the reign of Ardys, Herod. 1, 6, 15. Cf. also Her. 4, 12, and Stein's note thereon.

3. For the exploits of Sadyattes, Herod. 1, 16, 18 ; Nic. Dam. fr. 63 (M.)

4. For Alyattes, Herod. 1, 16-25, 73 (his tomb 1, 93) ; Nic. Dam. fr. 64 (M.); Strab. 14, 646. For the condition of Smyrna, cf. Duncker, 2, 440 ; only κωμηδόν need not mean in several public places ; it may be only one. The trade of Smyrna was taken over by Phocaea ; when the latter was destroyed by the Persians, Ephesus became important as a commercial city, Ramsay, Asia Minor, 62. The coinage of Lydia and the Ionic cities is described by Head in the Cat. Brit. Mus. Ionia, Lond. 1892, p. xv. seq.

5. The battles between the Lydians and Medes took place according to some in 610 B.C. (see Duncker, 2, 339), more correctly acc. to others in 585. Cf. Meyer, § 486, the 28th May.

6. The reign of Croesus is placed by Meyer, G. d. A. p. 583, in the years 560-46. His history in Herod. 1, 26 seq. The best account of the reign of Croesus is now that of Radet, La Lydie.

7. Croesus and Alcmaeon, Herod. 6, 125. This story is chronologically as improbable as the meeting between Croesus and Solon. Herod. 1, 30-33 ; cf. Meyer, G. d. A. § 488. It is no use saying that Solon, Thales and Alcmaeon may at a pinch be brought into personal contact with Croesus ; these stories have a typical value, and deserve to be related for that reason ; as also is remarked by Radet, La Lydie, p. 240, in almost identical words, although, as it appears, he does not know my book. In the intercourse with Croesus, Thales shews the importance of Hellenic philosophy, Solon that of Hellenic practical wisdom, while Alcmaeon displays a weak point in the Hellenic character, which unfortunately recurs only too often, the inability to resist the desire of gain. Croesus, on the other hand, as the type of the wealthy barbarian potentate, is

quite in his right place. The part is afterwards played by Amasis. We are right in saying that if the stories are not true, at all events they have been well invented. This constitutes an element of greatness in Herodotus, that he describes the Hellenic character in a more naive fashion than many modern writers, who discover ideal motives when very material ones really turned the scale. Croesus' subsequent life at the Persian Court as the exponent of Greek wisdom is also a very happy idea.

8. Some modern works refer to gold and silver coinage of Croesus, the existence of which is supposed to be proved, and to be due to an innovation introduced by this king, in consequence of which electrum fell into disuse. It is as well to remark that these statements rest upon conjectures, which, however probable they may be, have not the force of fact. Gold and silver coins, which are ascribed to Croesus, are extant: Coins of the Ancients, I. A. 13-16; the expression Κροισεῖοι στατῆρες is proved: cf. Poll. 3, 87, 9, 84; but whether the above coins are the Κροισεῖοι στατῆρες is uncertain, as is the statement that Croesus exchanged electrum for a gold standard. Very often in these matters the latest conjectures of specialists are treated as facts by non-specialists. That would not matter if one only knew how far the assertion was fact and how far mere hypothesis.

9. Inscription of Naboned, Pinches in Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. Nov. 1882, and Transact. S.B.A. 7, 139. The so-called Cylinder of Cyrus, Babylonian priests' inscriptions in honour of Cyrus, Rawlinson, Cuneif. Insc. of West. Asia, 5, 35 and Journ. R. Asiat. Soc. 1800. Cf. Evers, Das Emporkommen der pers. Macht unter Cyrus, Progr. Königst. Realg. Berl. 1884. For the remodelling of the legends of Cyrus by the Greeks, see Bauer, Kyrossage, Wiener Akad. 1882. Ansan is believed to be Susiana.

10. As regards the character of Cyrus, we make the following remarks in opposition to the enthusiastic admiration of Meyer, G. d. A. § 506. Cyrus was certainly a great man, and the Persians were right in lauding him (Herod. 3, 160). Napoleon I. was also a great ruler, and Cyrus may be compared with Napoleon in energy and ability. But he resembles him also in another respect. In Babylon Cyrus assumed the character of a worshipper of Marduk and Nabu, and by his treatment of the Jews, whom he released from prison, he may have made them believe that he was a servant of Jahve. In the same way Napoleon played the Mahommedan in Egypt. Calculating policy is unmistakable in both cases. In spite of this Meyer says of Cyrus that he was "without doubt a pious Masdajasnier" (worshipper of Ahuramazda). There are no proofs, and probability is against it. If he

was so in the sense that Napoleon was a good Catholic, we might grant the assumption, but that after all is not saying much. We would gladly believe in the lofty nature of Cyrus' character if his accommodating proceedings in religious matters did not show that he knew how to calculate, and understood the art of creating an effect, like Napoleon I. Cyrus is praised as gentle (πατήρ Her. 3, 89), so too was Napoleon when it suited him, and it is evident that Cyrus could be gentle from motives of policy. We can only make a passing allusion to the similarity of their end, which is not merely an external one. That the first Persian kings often accommodated themselves to polytheism is noticed by Radet, La Lydie, p. 256, who also points out how Darius, according to the inscription of Magnesia (Bull. Corr. Hell. 1889, pp. 538-541), worshipped Apollo after the manner of his forefathers.

11. Duncker has said that by "the great kingdom" the oracle meant *bona fide* the kingdom of Cyrus (4^4, 321), for it certainly would not have sacrificed the Spartans, whom it recommended as allies. But the priests of Delphi, however good geographers they might be, could not have known anything of the real power of Cyrus. Hence in dragging the Spartans into the conflict they were exposing them to incalculable dangers. We therefore do not do them an injustice if we assume that they purposely gave an ambiguous answer, and it is also not impossible that they preferred Lydian gold to the friendship of Sparta, for they afterwards played a similar part between Persia and Greece. With regard to the first question of Croesus, what he was doing on a certain day (Herod. 1, 47), the more modern defenders of the Delphic oracle adopt different arguments. Göttling (Abh. 1, 66, 67) attributes a profound meaning to the answer; Duncker (4^4, 316) thinks that the oracle must have refused to answer such a question altogether. But if the priests themselves invented the question, as Duncker assumes, it could not be of an unsuitable character; and are we really to try to find a deeper signification in the utterance of an oracle than the pious men of antiquity represented by Herodotus? Herodotus' idea of the oracle, which depicts it as contending in cunning with mankind (χρ. κίβδηλος), must have more value for us than the idealized views of the present age.—Croesus recognized the Spartans as the leading power in Greece.

12. The *locus classicus* for the downfall of the Lydian kingdom is the account of Herodotus (1, 46, seq.), to which we may add Ephorus (fr. 100), and Diodorus (Exc. Vat. 26 virt.), who include the treachery of Eurybates, and Nic. Dam. fr. 68, who spins out the story of the burning in a pathetic manner. Ctesias (fr. 31, M.) gives a totally different account. Xenophon uses Herodotus

freely. Just. 1, 7 and Polyaen. 6, 6 make use of Herodotus and Ctesias. The various accounts are reproduced in detail by Duncker, 4^4, 298 seq. and criticized. The intended burning of Croesus, which would have been contrary to Persian custom, appears to be a distortion of the fact, that Croesus wished to burn himself as a sacrifice for his nation. Radet, however (La Lydie, p. 256), observes with justice, that pure Mazdeism had at that time not fully penetrated into the Persian kingdom.—Cf. Meyer, G. d. Alt. § 502, 503, in agreement with whom, as well as with Stein in his note to Herodotus, and others, I place the fall of Croesus in 546 B.C. The chronological questions have been treated in recent years by many, among others by Büdinger and Unger.

13. The subjection of the Greeks of Asia Minor by the Persians, Herod. 1, 141-176. The contest in cunning between the Cymaean Aristodicus and the oracle of the Branchidae, Her. 1, 158, 159, is interesting.

14. Sardinia enjoyed an unmerited reputation among the Asiatic Greeks in the sixth century, Her. 1, 170; 5, 106, 124 —an example of a kind of exaggeration not uncommon in times when colonization is in great favour.

CHAPTER XXIV

GROWTH OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY, LITERATURE AND ART IN ASIA MINOR — FIRST STEPS OF ARCHITECTURE AND SCULPTURE IN GREECE

In the previous chapters we have described how the cities of Asia Minor endeavoured to maintain themselves against the kingdoms of the interior with more or less success. Although individual communities perished, yet those that remained preserved their national character. The Greeks of Asia Minor and the islands—together with those of the west — were always, up to the close of the sixth century B.C., at the head of the intellectual progress of Hellas.[1] In a historical age and with real historical characters they followed the path which had been first trodden by the dark and mysterious figure of Homer. There arose a race of singers, the Homeridae, who continued the recitation and the completion of the Homeric poems from age to age. Rhapsodists of no particular extraction prosecuted the work. But the brilliant example of Homer produced other effects. Gifted poets were prompted to treat other portions of the legend in epic fashion. The subject of the Trojan war remained the main source of attraction. A succession of fresh poets, of whose names we have no authentic record, celebrated the events which preceded and followed the Iliad : the destruction of Troy and the return of the heroes. Other epic poems were the Thebais, the Oedipodeia and the Epigoni.

The story of Heracles presented also an excellent subject for narrative poetry. One brief episode of his life was the taking of Oechalia, on which occasion Heracles killed Eurytus and carried off his daughter Iole; probably the hero's end was also described in it. Peisander of Cameirus recited the whole history of Heracles in the seventh century B.C.; the Corinthian legends were narrated by Eumelus, who took part in the founding of Syracuse about 735 B.C. The ancients were of opinion that all these poems were inferior to those of Homer, *i.e.*, to the Iliad and the Odyssey. Their contents only have been preserved in the heroic legends of the Greeks, the verses themselves are lost.

The oldest form of poetry was undoubtedly the hymn to the god; but none of these hymns have come down to us. But when narrative poetry became predominant, a new form was given to the hymn, which became a narrative of the deeds of the god; the deity was also anthropomorphized in its worship. Of the hymns which are ascribed to Homer, several are still extant; they evidently originated in Ionia and the Ionic islands of the Aegean.

The epic poetry of the Greeks may be roughly styled the poetry of the monarchical age. It depicts in the main the mode of life and institutions of that period, and was for the most part composed in the time of the kings. With the supremacy of the aristocracy, a new branch of the poetic art, the lyric, appears on the scene. Aristocracy, as opposed to monarchy, is based on the idea that special honour is not due to the individual at the head of the state alone, but that the share, which the leaders of the nation really have in the government, should also be expressed in externals. The subjective element is a prominent factor in the aristocratic constitution, and this element is also the essence of lyric poetry. And just as aristocracy did not take the place of monarchy suddenly and abruptly, but gradually grew out of it, so we find a connecting link in Greek poetry between epic

and lyric verse, appearing at the moment when the epic vein becomes exhausted, and marking the transition clearly in point of form. This link is elegiac poetry, which adds the pentameter to the hexameter of heroic verse. The first notable elegiac poet was Callinus of Ephesus. When the Cimmerians from the northern coasts of the Black Sea threatened the maritime cities of Ionia, he incited his countrymen to a brave defence. We have already mentioned other elegiac poets or shall refer to them subsequently; we must now devote some space to the first and greatest lyric poet of Greece, Archilochus. By the ancients he was placed almost in the same rank with Homer, another reason for regretting that only unimportant fragments of his works have come down to us. He was a Parian, son of a priest of Demeter Thesmophorus, named Telesicles, at whose instigation the island of Thasos was colonized. Archilochus does not appear to have gone thither at once, but he certainly took part in the settlement of the Colophonians, who founded Siris on the Gulf of Tarentum. Afterwards he proceeded to Thasos, where, however, he was not happy. He took part in the struggles of the colonists against their enemies on the mainland, and refers to them in his poems, but in the tone of a superior man, who is bound to fight without feeling any great inclination thereto. His poems treat of fighting, but also of drinking when on duty; he criticizes the appearance and bearing of his leaders, and consoles himself for the loss of his shield with the hope of getting a better one. Events in Paros provided him with the material for his most famous poems, which were in iambic metre. In these satires his most severe attack was on Lycambes, who had promised Archilochus his daughter Neobule in marriage, but afterwards gave the preference to a wealthier suitor. The father and daughter were said to have hanged themselves in despair. Archilochus fell in a war with Naxos by the hand of a certain Calondas (about 664 B.C.), on whom the Pythia imposed the duty of

propitiating the soul of the dead man, because he had killed a poet so beloved by the gods. Archilochus also wrote hymns.

But the composition of hymns, not in the epic style of the Homeric hymns, but merely as songs of praise, was practised chiefly by the Aeolians in Lesbos. The first of these Aeolian hymn-writers was Terpander (seventh century B.C.) On one occasion, when the Spartans were quarrelling, the Delphic oracle bade them let the harp of Terpander sound in their midst. The remedy was successful, and the sacred music restored concord. Terpander invented a regular choral song divided into strophes. In Sparta a special opportunity for the performance of choral music was furnished by the festival of the Carneia, celebrated in August in honour of Apollo, at which a poetical competition also took place. Terpander won the prize, and ever afterwards the question was first asked whether there was a singer from Lesbos present, in order that he might sing before the other competitors. Arion, a later poet than Terpander, was also a Lesbian, from Methymna. He was the first to apply the choral song specially to the service of Dionysus, and was considered a master of the dithyrambic form. He also acquired fame in foreign countries, notably in pleasure-loving Corinth, a result of the cheerful character of his poetry. The poetical art was beginning to adorn the courts of the tyrants.

The representatives of purely subjective lyric poetry lingered longest in Lesbos, in the persons of the gifted Alcaeus and the passionate Sappho. Alcaeus was of noble race, and a brother of the leaders of the nobility who, with the aid of Pittacus, overthrew and killed the tyrants of Mytilene about the year 610 B.C. He fought under Pittacus against the Athenians on the Hellespont in defence of the fortress of Achilleium. Pittacus slew the Olympian victor Phrynon in single combat, and thus saved the Lesbian citadel. Alcaeus, however, in his flight threw away his

shield, and afterwards, like Archilochus, ridiculed the loss in his poems, and mocked the wise and brave Pittacus. The poems of Alcaeus consist of outpourings of the heart on politics, love and wine. Of all trees, he sings, the vine should first be planted;—in this as in many other points, as well as in the confession of having thrown away his shield, he was imitated afterwards by Horace. As it was Pittacus who decreed that crimes committed in a state of drunkenness should receive double punishment, we can easily understand that Alcaeus felt antipathy to the legislator from the first.

Sappho of Mytilene competed with Alcaeus for the prize of lyric verse. Love was the principal theme of her poetry. A legend widely circulated in antiquity relates that when her love was scorned by Phaon she threw herself from the Leucadian rock into the sea. That a woman of gentle birth like Sappho could win and retain universal respect as a composer of songs of a highly personal character, shows the peculiarly exalted position held by women in certain parts of Greece at that period.

If we follow the development of poetry still further, and in the first place return to Ionia and its elegiac poetry, we see that, while Callinus and Archilochus, with all their tendency to enjoy life, still retained a good deal of energy, the latter element begins gradually to fail in poetry. Simonides of Samos draws the moral that man has no power to shape his destiny, and that he can but await the future with calmness. His satire on women is famous. Mimnermus of Colophon struck a vigorous note when he urged his countrymen to resist the Lydians by dwelling on their ancient valour. But Ionia succumbed, and most of the fragments we still have of Mimnermus are devoted to praise of the enjoyment of life. Phocylides of Miletus lived somewhat later; he was a gnomic poet, who, in a truly Greek spirit, sets up the golden mean as the one thing needful. Hipponax of Ephesus was a satirist, who lived in poverty at Clazomenae; he was deformed, and a

butt for the mockery of his neighbours, but repaid them with similar or even better coin. He belonged to that class of poets who, when they suffer hunger, thirst, and cold, do not fail to inform the rich of it in their verse.

From the beginning of the sixth century B.C. poetry is often pressed into the service of morality. The poetical art itself assumes a didactic character. Even where it is purely narrative, as in Homer, it still seeks to edify. In those times there was no division of aims; each art was at the service of the whole man, and thus moral instruction was never excluded. The poetry of Hesiod still further developed this characteristic. In later times the paths diverged. The epic and many of the lyric poets aim less at instruction, the elegiac poets more so, when amatory poetry happens not to be their special subject. It had always been the custom to put maxims of practical wisdom in as brief a form as possible; the Greeks called these *gnomai*. Such *gnomai* could attain the desired brevity by being composed in verse. But this form was also soon discarded, for although at first it had been an aid to brevity, yet under certain circumstances it led to useless prolixity. A gnomé laconically expressed in prose gradually came into favour in Greece. People also became accustomed to see wisdom in the conduct of those who, while paying little or no regard to beauty of expression, brought the principles of philosophy to bear on their practical life.

Even the noblest aspirations of the mind are liable to the influence of certain tendencies, which at times partake of the nature of fashion. About the year 600 B.C. a general craving for instruction in what was expedient and right arose throughout Greece. Religion in Greece never maintained its position by means of dogma; it was and remained a means of winning the favour of the gods. But it was seen that another and perhaps surer road to happiness lay in a rightly-ordered life. How to arrive at this was felt by all and known to many, but it was given to few to find a short and concise expression for

what all admitted in silence, and these few could only speak with authority when they themselves were bright examples of the truth of their doctrine. About the year 600 B.C. there existed a not inconsiderable number of men of this stamp. They were called the Wise Men, and, because a definite number rounds off an expression of this kind well, they received the appellation of the Seven Wise Men. Of course only some of these Seven were recognized absolutely as such; stars of the first magnitude are patent to all, but lesser lights shine with more equal brilliancy, and hence some placed one and some another among the Seven. A later age measured them by a special ethical standard, and modified the old opinions. The Delphic oracle had from the outset made itself an organ of public opinion in this respect; its general aim had been to secure for religion an influence on practical life, and for a long time it had done good by constantly inculcating circumspection and moderation. Thales was by common consent placed at the head of the Seven; we shall refer to him presently. Pittacus generally came next, and after him Bias of Priene, a man of considerable activity in politics, who was the most successful in clothing his wisdom in brief sentences, such as: Wisdom is the fairest possession—Begin slowly but persevere well in what thou hast begun—The man who cannot endure misfortune is unfortunate—If thou hast done a good deed, attribute it to the gods. Solon the Athenian came next; and after him, according to an old-established view, Cleobulus of Lindus, who ruled over his city as king, tyrant, or aesymnetes, rebuilt the Athenian temple in Lindus, and composed poems and enigmas. The sixth was Cheilon of Sparta, a man who had done good service to the Spartan state; and the seventh Periander of Corinth. Plato, however, refused to admit Periander as worthy of universal honour, and substituted for him a comparatively unknown Malian, named Myson, whom the Delphic god once declared to be the wisest of mankind.

Among others included in the number of the Seven were Pherecydes of Syrus, the teacher of Pythagoras; a certain Aristodemus of Sparta; the famous seer Epimenides of Crete; and lastly, a wise Scythian, named Anacharsis. The majority of these wise men belong to the eastern Greeks, and the Seven are so distributed that two are given to Ionia, one to Aeolia, one to the Dorian island of Rhodes, and one to each of the three great cities of Greece proper, Sparta, Athens, and Corinth. This explains the admission of Periander into the worthy company. Corinth could not produce a better man! This group of wise men is a counterpart of the brilliant circle which met in Sicyon under the roof of Cleisthenes. The west had not yet turned its wisdom to account, for there is no western Greek among the Seven; and, strange to say, Athens wins distinction in both spheres, for elegance in the persons of a Philaid and an Alcmaeonid, for wisdom in that of the Nelid Solon.

But the age in which the Greek nation paid special honour to the men who succeeded in making their wisdom of practical utility for civic life, also witnessed the formation of purely theoretical science. Its founder was Thales, who was at once the first wise man and the first philosopher of Greece (*sophos* and *philosophos*). Thales, son of Hexamius, came of an old noble stock, the family of the Thelidae. He appears to have lived about 624-546. He is said to have acquired his knowledge of natural science during a stay in Egypt, which, in view of the relations between Egypt and Miletus, is credible enough.[2] He measured the height of the Pyramids by their shadow, studied the relative size and the motions of the heavenly bodies, and was the first to inform the Greeks that the moon received its light from the sun, and to tell them the cause of eclipses of the sun. He is said to have predicted an eclipse of the sun in a certain year, apparently that which took place during a battle between the Lydians and Medes, consequently the year 585 B.C. His scientific reputation is illustrated by

the following anecdote :—having observed from the heavenly signs that the next olive harvest would be a very plentiful one, he rented all the oil-presses in Miletus and Chios beforehand, and afterwards, when the demand for them became so great, sublet them at a high rental, simply to show that a philosopher can make money if he likes. But Thales did not only endeavour to explain unconnected natural phenomena, he went a step further. He propounded a theory of the origin of the universe, which makes him the first philosopher in the strict sense of the word, the father of that particular kind of wisdom which may be loved and striven for but can never be attained. With Thales begins the history of the endeavours of mankind to reduce the inconceivable into language. To explain a thing is to state its cause and consequently its origin. Thales set to work to investigate the origin of the world and especially that of the earth. He affirmed that everything proceeded from water. In making this assertion, he put forward nothing which clashed with the prevailing ideas of the Greeks, for, according to their poetical views, Oceanus was one of the oldest of created beings, from whom nearly everything proceeded. According to Thales the earth floats upon the waters, which produce earthquakes. Here also he is in agreement with the popular notion of the earthshaker Poseidon.

His attempts to penetrate the secrets of nature were continued by a younger contemporary and fellow-countryman, Anaximander. The latter devoted himself chiefly to geometrical experiments, made sundials in the Babylonian fashion, and was the first to draw coast outlines upon a tablet. According to him the earth stands motionless in the centre of the universe, the stars are fixed in their spheres and revolve round the earth with them. Anaximander would not admit water as the primary element, but reverted to the ancient conception of chaos. From nature in a state of chaos proceeded first heat and cold ; the fusion of these two produced fluidity, which, by means of fire, generated air, water and earth. Fluidity was a

kind of primeval mud from which living creatures were formed; they were originally fish-like in character. Anaximander was the first to publish his views on nature in a special treatise.

The third, but somewhat younger philosopher, Anaximenes, was likewise a Milesian. He was born about 575 B.C. Speculation on the origin and evolution of the universe, which had been only a part of the work of Thales and Anaximander, was his main subject. He was not satisfied with the conclusions of either of his predecessors. His theory was that air is the true principle of life. Anaximenes was the last of the Ionic philosophers. In later times Heracleitus of Ephesus followed in their footsteps, but went far beyond them.

But Ionia was also the birthplace of geography and history. Anaximander's geographical map was improved by Hecataeus of Miletus, who added a treatise on the earth, its seas, rivers, products, inhabitants and towns, with the title "A Journey round the Earth" (*ges periodos*). History began with the logographers, who collected and continued in prose the poetical and popular records of the past history of countries, nations and cities. In the poems of the Hesiodic school, genealogical coherence had been the chief point; isolated poets, such as Eumelus the Corinthian, had begun to relate local legends. Subsequently Mimnermus had celebrated the exploits of the Colophonians and Smyrnaeans against King Gyges with a view more to glorifying the cities than individual families, and so had treated his subject almost historically, as was afterwards done by Xenophanes of Colophon in his narrative of the founding of his native city. The foundations of real history were thus laid. It began, as is supposed, with a Milesian named Cadmus, who lived about the middle of the sixth century B.C., and is said to have related the founding of Miletus and other Ionian cities. His successors in the art of historical composition bring us somewhat beyond the chronological limits which we fixed for this chapter, for however vague the dates of the following logographers may be, it is certain that they extend into the period

of the Persian wars. Charon produced a historical work upon his native city Lampsacus, and, like Dionysus of Miletus, treated Persian history, while the Lydian Xanthus chose as his subject the history of his native country. Acusilaus of Argos belonged to Greece proper, but Hippys of Rhegium is the first of the western historians. The most important of the logographers, however, was Hecataeus of Miletus, whom we have just noted as the first geographer of Greece, and who played a not unimportant part as a politician at the time of the Ionic revolt. His history bears the characteristic title of genealogies. He begins with Deucalion and Hellen, thus proving himself a genuine disciple of the Hesiodic school, and relates, probably from his own imagination, the story of the descendants of Deucalion in his first book; in the second, that of the Heraclidae; in the third, that of the heroes of the Peloponnese; and in the fourth, that of the Greeks in Asia Minor. Although Hecataeus claimed to be of divine origin (in the fifteenth generation!) he did not believe all that was told him about the heroes of the past. He was the father of the rationalistic movement which was styled Euhemerism in later times. The hair-splitting, which is characteristic of the Greeks, is generally supposed to begin with Euripides or the Sophists; some find it even in Herodotus; but Hecataeus refines and subtilizes, and he certainly was not the first to do so. It was part of the Greek mind, and the Greeks would not have achieved what they did if they had not been a curious, critical and argumentative people. The last of the logographers, Hellanicus of Mytilene, belongs entirely to the fifth century; he is a link between the old style and the new, which begins with Herodotus.

However much we may sympathize with the Phocaeans, who preferred to fly to foreign shores rather than remain in their homes under a Persian protectorate, yet we cannot but do justice to the peaceful and patient Milesians, whose civilization must have been of a far more comprehensive kind than that of the Phocaeans. The Milesians first proved

that they could fight, and then accepted favourable terms, which were afterwards repeatedly confirmed by the barbarians; and they did so in order that they might devote all their energies to their commerce, a commerce the extent and activity of which we can hardly exaggerate. If there were people in Miletus who had racial connections, relatives and friends in the Crimea, in Sinope and in Egypt, and had perhaps themselves lived in one or the other of these distant countries, if the Milesians had not only visited these eastern lands, but knew those of the west as well—for Sybaris was a second home to them, and many a Milesian had accompanied Sybarite or Etruscan merchants to the shores of the Tyrrhenian Sea, where they had come into contact with Carthaginians, Ligurians, Celts, Iberians, perhaps even with the then obscure Romans — must not this intercourse with the most remote countries and the most varied nationalities have given a powerful stimulus to the minds of men who had a turn for scientific investigation? It is therefore not surprising that Miletus, which of all Greek cities had perhaps the largest connection with foreign countries, was the first home of Greek natural science, Greek geography and history, and Greek philosophy; but none the less must we count it a glory of the Milesian people and the Milesian government, that they encouraged all this intellectual activity. The whole trade of Miletus no doubt bore the same proportion to that of any single Phoenician city as Greek commerce in general did to Phoenician, but what far greater service has been rendered by Miletus to intellectual progress than by any Phoenician city! It was the Athens of the age preceding the Persian wars.

We must now devote our attention to Greek art, which we left in its first uncertain stages of development in the pre-Homeric and pre-Doric period. We do not meet with it again till the end of the seventh century, apart from specimens of pottery, many of which must be older, and passing over for a moment literary tradition, which furnishes nothing but names.

We find it once more in the ruins of temples, in sculpture, and vase-paintings. Of these many belong to the western half of the Greek world, the political history of which we have not yet taken up. Yet it seems better not to divide a connected subject, but to bring together in this place the little that is to be said of the history of Greek art before the beginning of the fifth century, for it certainly spread from the east westwards.

It is clear that Greek art received its impulse from the East, but equally evident that it succeeded in attaining independence at an early date, and that it worked on its own lines and with its own creative methods. The impulse came partly from Phoenicia and partly from Asia Minor, but the closer connection with the latter made the influence of Asia Minor of more importance. In the designs of the vase-paintings and in the technique of the sculpture we can discern the transition from Asiatic to Greek art, but not in the architecture. Greek architecture confronts us in history almost like Greek poetry, as a divinity sprung full-grown from the brain of the artist.

The transition from the art of Asia Minor to that of Greece is most clearly marked in the decoration of pottery, which represents alone the whole field of the important art of painting. We have already, in discussing the remains of Mycenae, referred to the vases called after that city, and to those ornamented with geometrical figures. Chalcidian and Melian pottery has of late attracted attention, but it is not of so much importance as the Corinthian and Asiatic styles. The decoration of these vases is taken direct from the countries about the Euphrates. Rosettes, fantastic animals and winged men remind us of Assyria. On the larger vessels the decorations are in bands either of animals or men, and also mythological subjects. The ground of these vases is usually yellow, and the figures of various colours. Next we have, in the sixth century, vases with black figures on a red ground, with excellent mythological pictures from the cycle of legends of Dionysus, Heracles, Theseus, and the Trojan war. The Pana-

thenaic amphorae belong to this class. Towards the close of the sixth century appear vases with red figures on a black ground. Some of the black-figured vases are masterpieces of art, as, for instance, the François vase at Florence, the work of Ergotimus and Clitias.[3]

The history of Greek plastic art begins with the mythical Daedalus, who was supposed to have been a native of Athens, but left behind him traces of his activity as a sculptor and architect in many places, both Greek and barbarian. He was the first to give statues the semblance of life, and to detach the legs and the arms. He represents the earliest stage of development of his art, from the idol in the form of a pillar to figures really resembling a human being. We find schools of art in Samos and Chios in the second half of the seventh century—in Samos, Rhoecus and his son Theodorus, who distinguished themselves as architects, and are said to have invented the art of casting bronze; in Chios the family of artists is still more numerous: Melas, his son Micciades, his grandson Archermus, and his great-grandsons Bupalis and Athenis, were all sculptors. Glaucus of Chios is said to have invented the art of soldering iron. Crete, which at that period was very fond of art, possessed the sculptors Scyllis and Dipoenus, who transferred their skill to the Peloponnese, where Sicyon became their headquarters. Interest in art became general in the Peloponnese; we find even two Laconians, Dontas and Dorycleidas, mentioned as sculptors. A special impulse was given to sculpture by Olympia, where it became customary to erect the statues of successful athletes, which at first were stiff, like the old idols, but afterwards gradually assumed more natural attitudes. The masters of the Sicyonian, Argive and Aeginetan schools do not belong to the period now under consideration. Athens also does not take the important position which she held in the fifth century. It is known, however, that after Hippias left Athens the free citizens had bronze statues by Antenor erected in the citadel to the two tyrannicides, Har-

modius and Aristogeiton, which were afterwards carried away by Xerxes. As famous works of this period we must mention the chest of Cypselus at Olympia, and the richly ornamented throne of Apollo at Amyclae by Bathycles of Magnesia, on the Maeander.

But the history of Greek plastic art is fortunately not merely a record of these names. We also possess a considerable number of works which are traced to this epoch, and give us an idea of what the period before the year 500 could achieve. Many of these have been known for some time, others, especially those of Greece proper, have been brought to light by the excavations of the last decades. The metopes of Selinus have been known to us for sixty years; those on the oldest temple (known as C) betray an imperfect sense of the proper proportion of the parts of the body; while those of the temple known as F remind us of the Aeginetan marbles. Some reliefs found afterwards at Sparta are of a similar character, but of less importance. A series of figures of naked youths, which may pass for images of Apollo (like the Apollo of Orchomenus and the Apollo of Thera in Athens, and the Apollo of Tenea in Munich), reveal the spirit of the Peloponnesian school, which was influenced by Scyllis and Dipoenus. Among the archaic statues lately discovered in Delos, we find a very ancient Artemis, which reminds us of the holy *xoana* or wooden images, and a running winged figure of a woman, probably representing a *Niké*, which possesses a double interest for us by reason of its being in all probability the work of the sculptor Archermus, who is known to have been the first to produce a winged *Niké*. The figures on the frieze at Assos and the seated statues of the sacred road from Miletus to the temple of Apollo at Branchidae (which are unfortunately in a bad state of preservation), are of value as monuments of archaic art. But the Attic specimens are particularly interesting, sepulchral monuments with figures of the dead, the most noteworthy of which is the statue of Aristion by Aristocles,

preserved in the Theseum, and fragments of other statues and reliefs, especially the statues recently found on the Acropolis. On the faces we notice the stereotyped smile of the Aeginetan statues, which may be regarded as an attempt on the part of the Greeks to give a life-like expression to the face. We can only refer briefly here to the quantity of terra-cotta objects found in all parts of Greece, in which the treatment of the facial expression is of great interest. The publications of Kekulé will gradually enlighten us further on this subject. It is also out of the question to study in detail here the wealth of art revealed by the coins of this period. In this field western Greece already distinguishes itself more than eastern or central Greece. By the year 500 B.C. Greek sculpture had reached the threshold of its highest achievement, which it was about to cross under the influence of the feelings aroused by the great national war.

The position with regard to our knowledge of Greek architecture is a peculiar one. We cannot here, as in the plastic art, trace on the various remains the gradual progress from humble beginnings to the highest perfection, although from a historical point of view it would be of even greater importance to be able to do so. For architecture is not like the plastic an imitative art, but a purely creative one. It has forms peculiar to itself, and the question arises—How were they arrived at? We find the different styles of Greek architecture in a state of almost complete development; the preparatory stages are lacking. But we can perfectly well comprehend the nature of Greek architecture. The moving principle is the column. In point of form the styles are divided into Doric and Ionic; for the Corinthian is but a development of the latter. The Doric style has a lofty simplicity, shown by the absence of a special base and by the unadorned capital; the Ionic has more elegance: a diversified base, a slenderer shaft, and a more elaborate capital; the entablature of the columns is also more varied, but we miss the beautiful triglyphs and metopes.

The Doric style with its greater severity (masculine as contrasted with the feminine Ionic) gives the impression of greater originality. It is highly probable that the Doric style was the result of Egyptian, and the Ionic more of Asiatic influence. What are called proto-Doric columns have been pointed out in Egypt. The characteristic element of the Ionic capital, the volute, is a very ancient mode of decoration, and appears sometimes single and sometimes double, as in the Ionic column. In its single form we meet with it on the roof of the thesaurus at Orchomenus discovered by Schliemann, and in its double form on the gold plates of Mycenae. But to apply this well-known kind of decoration to columns in such a way that it fits them as if it were specially created for them (as theorists have proved to their satisfaction), marks the inventive genius of Greek art.[4]

We now approach a number of questions which have long been discussed but cannot yet be settled. Were the Greek styles originally invented for wooden buildings? This cannot be proved. It is true that many parts of the normal Greek temple look like a stone imitation of what was originally built in wood; but other portions do not fit in with the theory. The most recent investigations make it probable that the walls of the temples were often built of unbaked tiles dried in the sun. Another question concerns the history of Greek architecture during that period of which remains have been preserved, in other words, the chronological classification of extant monuments. Since the time of Semper his theory of a division of the Doric style into periods has found favour, starting from the lax archaic and proceeding to the strict archaic, etc. Unfortunately the theory rests too much on unknown quantities, with the result that the division into periods is on a more elaborate scale than is warranted by the materials, and consequently renders us little assistance in gaining a clearer idea of the few monuments that remain to us.

The remains of temples belonging to the period under

discussion are in the Doric style. This may be due to the fact that the Doric style was more in vogue than the Ionic at that time. In any case, the Doric style was the favourite one in the west. The Ionic is said to have first come into use about the beginning of the sixth century B.C., at the restoration of the temple of Artemis at Ephesus; yet there can be no doubt that it is of higher antiquity. Strange to say, the architects of the Ephesian temple were Cretans, Chersiphron of Cnossus and his son Metagenes. The building was of vast extent, more than 400 feet long, and over 200 feet in breadth; it was a *dipteros*, *i.e.* provided with a double peristyle of separate columns. The Ionians had probably gazed on its colossal prototypes in Egypt and so been inspired with the idea of imitating them. The remains that have been lately discovered of the temple belong to the time of its reconstruction, after the famous fire at the birth of Alexander. Another equally colossal building was the temple of Hera in Samos, begun by the Samian Rhoecus and completed by Polycrates. There were other colossal temples of that period in Clarus, Phocaea and Branchidae. The principal divinities of Asia Minor were meant to inhabit splendid dwellings; and Peisistratus wished to erect a no less colossal temple to the Olympian Zeus at Athens. In the west, we find few records of the building of temples, but some grand ruins, all in the Doric style, and in places which became unimportant at an early date in antiquity and have long since become desolate. The remains of two temples are found in the swamps of Metapontum; at Paestum (Poseidonia) there are three, all in an excellent state of preservation, and presenting an imposing spectacle in the desert plain surrounded by mountains and the sea. At Syracuse there are also two on the site of Ortygia, but the effect is spoiled by the modern edifices, of which they actually form a part; a third, standing in the open, has barely two columns remaining. The ruins of Selinus are on the grandest scale of all, and have proved of

great importance in the history of art; they have not, however, been sufficiently studied from an architectural point of view. Some remains of temples in Corfu and at Corinth are considered to be the oldest Doric buildings extant.

NOTES

1. For the contents of this chapter I must refer my readers to the special works on the history of Greek literature, philosophy and art, which are quoted in the Introduction.

2. The influence of the east on Greek culture in the sixth century B.C. must not be estimated too lightly. The Greeks were eager for knowledge, and the east was ahead of Greece in the various branches of science. The Greeks were settled all along the fringe of the continent, in the interior of which a more advanced civilization prevailed. Why should they not have endeavoured to make themselves acquainted with it? Every country did not close its doors to strangers; Egypt had ceased to do so in the sixth century, and the countries round the Euphrates did not do so, as far as we know. If we possess so little information about the travels of learned or curious Greeks to Babylon or Egypt, it is because the history of individuals generally, even of important persons, in those times is so little known to us, partly because of the scantiness of the records, and partly because it was not the custom to record such things in those days.

3. The recent excavations of the *débris* on the Acropolis at Athens, which date from the destruction wrought by the Persians, have furnished many contributions to the history of the earliest styles of vase-painting.

4. The Ionic capital, cf. Puchstein, Das ionische Kapitell, Berl. Wedelmannsprogramm, 1887. The beginnings of the capital are, as it appears to me, to be found on a fantastic decorative pillar in a painting belonging to a tomb of the old Egyptian empire: Perrot and Chipiez, I. fig. 317. Still more closely allied to the Ionic capital is one on a monument of 822 B.C. discovered at Sippar (Babylonia); see F. Hommel, Gesch. Babylon-Assyr. Berl. 1885 (copy of it at p. 596). But this specimen, in which the capital serves as a base of the column, is a long way removed from the harmony of Greek art.

CHAPTER XXV

GREATER GREECE AND SICILY; THEIR POLITICS AND THEIR CIVILIZATION

As we are tracing the steps by which the Greek intellect mounted from a lower to a higher stage of civilization, we must now turn our attention to the western division of the Greek world.

In Italy there arose two centres of Greek life, the Bay of Naples and the Gulf of Tarentum. To these must be added the Greek cities in what is now called Calabria, which were, however, more closely united with Sicily than with the other Italian colonies. Yet we find frequent intercourse between the second group, consisting chiefly of Tarentum, Metapontum, Sybaris and Crotona, and the third group, the principal members of which were Locri and Rhegium, while Cyme and Naples hold aloof, especially in politics, both from the cities of the Tarentine Gulf and from those of the southern extremity of Italy. This is a result of the formation of this part of Italy, the long ridge of which gathers into a large group of mountains just east of Campania. This range separates the Apulian plain from that of Campania; and here were the headquarters of the peoples who subsequently became the masters of the Greeks of Lower Italy. If we ask why Greek colonization should have turned in the direction of these three particular districts, we shall find that there were two reasons, the nature of the countries occupied, and the

character of the races which the Greeks found inhabiting them. The former must have had some attraction for the Greeks, while the latter must either have not assumed a very hostile attitude towards them, or must have been easily held in check by them. Both these conditions were found together only at these three points. Bays, islands and peninsulas—necessities of life to Greek sailors — were most conspicuous in Campania, and in a lesser degree at Tarentum, while the district now called Calabria, with its promontories and small bays, presented a coast-line at all events somewhat similar to that of Greece. Of the aborigines encountered by the Greeks, the Messapii were, it is true, not unwarlike, but they were also not far removed from the Greeks in civilization and customs, and were consequently ready to accept their higher culture by degrees. The Chones, Oenotrians and Sicels, farther west, were less warlike, and offered no great resistance to the Greeks. Finally the Oscans in Campania only profited by the commercial connection with the Greeks settled on their coast, without conceding to them any political influence. The friendly intercourse of Cyme and Naples with the interior was, however, very considerable. The absence of the two above-mentioned conditions, viz. a district suited by nature for Greek colonization, and peacefully disposed inhabitants, prevented the Greeks from getting a footing farther north on the Tyrrhenian Sea. Here the coast from Orbitello to Piombino with its two beautiful promontories and the islands of Giglio and Elba in front of them, reminding one of the Bay of Naples with Capri and Ischia, would have been very suitable for Hellenic colonization, but it was inhabited by the Etruscans, who were too powerful to submit to foreign merchants becoming possessors of independent cities within their territory. Hence no colonies were founded there which could be regarded as regular Greek cities. But no one can say how many scattered Greek settlements or small Greek communities may not have existed even in this region.

In Sicily the Greeks had taken possession chiefly of the eastern and southern districts. In the east there are several very good harbours, while in the south there are none, and yet three large and powerful cities, Gela, Agrigentum and Selinus were founded there. On the north coast there were only a few Greek settlements, while the Greeks were entirely cut off from the west, for the Phoenicians were concentrated in the north-west, and near them another people of Asiatic origin long maintained their independence, the Elymi, who possessed Mount Eryx, celebrated for its worship of Aphrodite, the city of Segesta, famous for its ruins, and the little town of Entella. Besides the Phoenicians and Elymi, there existed in Sicily two great races, the Sicani in the west, and the Sicels in the east, both of Italian origin. They were soon forced to give up most of their territory on the coast to the Greeks; in the interior they long remained more or less independent, although they could not escape from the influence of Greek civilization.

Thus the Greeks of Italy and Sicily were in a similar though somewhat better position than the Greeks of Asia Minor as regards the aborigines and the foreigners settled in the country, similar, because they had to maintain their position against foreign races, better, because these races did not possess the formidable power of great empires nor the dangerous allurements attaching to an ancient civilization. It is a fact that in western Greece, in Italy, and especially in Sicily, more successful statesmen arose than in eastern Greece.

We will take the colonies on the Bay of Naples first. Very little is known of their political history before the close of the sixth century B.C. The only thing known for certain is that Neapolis was unimportant and Cyme supreme in every way. But the influence of this city was of a very peaceful description. The Oscans, Umbrians, Etruscans and Messapii received their alphabets either directly or indirectly from the Cymaeans. Greek pottery made its way into central

Italy through Cyme. Several bronze articles of peculiar beauty found in Campanian tombs probably came through Cyme from Chalcis. The trading routes into the interior started from Cyme and proceeded *via* Nola, Suessula and Capua.[1] The Cymaeans appear to have had little political ambition, and hence they were able to have peaceful intercourse with the Etruscans, who probably forced their way into Campania in the ninth century B.C.

The influence exercised by Cyme on the Oscans and Etruscans had its counterpart in the effect produced by Tarentum on the Messapii, the Sallentines, and the Calabrians in the south-eastern peninsula, and the Iapygians (called Apulians by the Oscans), with their two branches of Peucetians and Daunians, extending farther north up to the mountain promontory of Garganus. They frequently offered a vigorous resistance to the Tarentines, even as late as the beginning of the fifth century B.C.; but wars with them are recorded even during the lifetime of Philanthus, the founder of Tarentum, and the Tarentines sent offerings to Delphi as a thanksgiving for their victories. But Tarentum had a marked influence on the civilization of all these peoples, and hence in later times it was asserted that they were really Greeks, Iapyx, Daunus, and Peucetius being said to be sons of Lycaon, and consequently Arcadians. Subsequently other Greek heroes were given to them: Idomeneus, Menelaus, Podaleirius, and notably Diomedes, who built the city of Argyrippe—supposed to be Argoshippium—in the territory of the Daunians. The position of Tarentum was peculiarly favourable for commerce, for the reason that it possessed the only good harbour on the whole gulf. This made it extremely important for the navigation of that age, which always hugged the line of the coast; ships had to put in there even if they were bound for other ports, and hence the traffic was continually on the increase.

We pass over for the moment the cities at the head of the Tarentine Gulf, and turn to the south-west, where our atten-

tion is demanded by institutions and events preceding in point of time those which make the history of Sybaris and Croton of importance. That the cities of Bruttium maintained close intercourse with those of Sicily is shown by their constitution. In Locri and Catana we find famous examples of early legislation. During a period of internal disorder the Locrians appealed to the Delphic oracle. It bade them adopt a new set of laws, and these were delivered to them by Zaleucus, who was inspired by Athene.[2] They were committed to writing—the first instance of written laws in Greece—about the year 660 B.C. According to Ephorus, Zaleucus compiled his laws from those of the Cretans, the Spartans, and the Areopagitae, that is, the Athenians. The principal innovation which he ascribes to Zaleucus is, that the latter fixed a maximum penalty for every offence, while up to that time the judges had been free to inflict punishments at their own discretion. Great stress was laid, as was always the case in antiquity, on the maintenance of the new laws; in Locri any one who proposed a change in them had to be prepared to suffer death if his proposal were rejected. It is also related that when the son of Zaleucus was condemned to suffer the legal penalty of loss of sight for the crime of adultery, and the people called for the remission of his sentence out of regard for his father, Zaleucus put out one of his son's eyes and one of his own, which certainly does more credit to the father than to the legislator. Locri is described as having a Cosmopolis as president and a council of one thousand members.

What Zaleucus did for Locri Charondas did for Catana.[3] He was younger than Zaleucus, and was said to have been his pupil. Aristotle gives high praise to the legislation of Charondas for the precision of its enactments. Diodorus, who erroneously assigns him to Thurii, mentions the law prohibiting the remarriage of a widower on pain of loss of civic rights, some wise provisions relating to the duties of guardians

and other matters, but, owing to the mistake above mentioned, these cannot be traced to Charondas with any certainty. It is more certain, however, that he made the law providing that a rich man who refused to undertake judicial functions should be liable to a higher penalty than a poor man in the same circumstances, and this points to the existence of a timocratic principle in the legislation of Catana also. The laws of Charondas are said to have been adopted generally in the Chalcidian towns of Italy and Sicily. They did not, however, have the same force in every one of them, for in Leontini we find a tyrant, said to be the first tyrant of Sicily, named Panaetius.[4] On one occasion when commanding at a review he made the rich horsemen surrender their horses and their arms, and then had them killed by the lower classes. He had persuaded the latter that the rich were deriving an unfair advantage from the war. This story shows that the timocratic element in the constitution of Charondas made itself felt in Leontini, although there was no proper public spirit among the citizens.

But the most pronounced example of tyranny was given by the Dorian city of Akragas, and only a short time after the founding of it.[5] The inhabitants wished to erect a splendid temple to Zeus Polieus in the citadel. A wealthy man, named Phalaris, was placed at the head of the works. This involved control of considerable sums of money and great influence over the workmen. Phalaris asserted that a quantity of building material was being stolen, and that it would therefore be advisable to build a wall round the citadel. When permission for this had been granted, he made the workmen, who were devoted to his interests, fall upon the people when assembled at the festival of the Thesmophoriae, and thus attained supreme power. He maintained his position for sixteen years, apparently from 570-554. He extended his sway over so large a portion of the island that he has been called tyrant of Sicily. He was notorious

for his cruelty, notably for the iron bull in which he had his victims burned, the inventor himself being the first of them. He was overthrown in a revolt. Certain circumstances tend to show that Phalaris formed a centre of resistance against the Phoenicians and Carthaginians. With him begins, as it seems, that series of generals, who for centuries protected the Greeks and the native population of the island against the Semitic race. This task was not completed until it was taken in hand by the Romans. If Phalaris began it, certainly he has received no thanks for his pains. Pindar holds him up as an object of abhorrence in contrast to the generous Croesus, and he has remained ever since the type of the very worst kind of tyrant.

In the sixth century Italy derived considerable advantage from the misfortunes of the Greeks in Asia Minor. The relations between the remote east and the far west of the Greek world were very close, and when life in Asia became less attractive, the first thought of the Greeks in those parts was to move westwards, and especially to Lower Italy, where the climate was mild, the soil fertile, and no powerful monarchs bore sway. It was the America of that age. Hence as early as the first half of the seventh century B.C. some Colophonians had founded the city of Siris on the Gulf of Tarentum. They were followed in the sixth century by the Phocaeans, who founded Alalia in Corsica and afterwards Hyele or Elea between the Gulfs of Salerno and Policastro. The usurpation of Polycrates finally had the effect of making the liberty-loving Samians emigrate and found the city of Dicaearchia (demonstratively so named) on the Bay of Naples, the site of the modern Pozzuoli. To the Cymaeans, who were masters of this coast, and without whose permission the Samians could not have settled here, this fresh accession of Greek strength was very acceptable, and besides Chalcis and Samos were on friendly terms. We shall describe the tyranny of Aristodemus Malacus in Cyme in a later chapter.

About the middle of the sixth century B.C. Sybaris and Croton were the most important cities of Lower Italy. Sybaris as a commercial town was the more important of the two, although it possessed no natural harbour. It was on most friendly terms with Miletus, whose ships put into Sybaris; the merchandise imported by the Milesians which did not find a market in the city itself or the immediate neighbourhood was forwarded overland to the maritime cities on the Tyrrhenian Sea, where there was a demand for it, especially on the part of the Etruscans, who in their turn despatched the products of their country by the same route to Sybaris, for shipment there in Milesian vessels. The Milesians did not venture into the Tyrrhenian Sea and the Etruscans never went eastwards; Sybaris was the city and the Sybaritic territory the country which served as a go-between for the intercourse of these two great commercial and maritime powers, and this position of Sybaris was the source of her wealth. This explains the interest Sybaris had in possessing so large a extent of territory. Four Oenotrian tribes, comprising twenty-five towns, are said to have owned allegiance to the Sybarites. Consequently the roads which led from Sybaris to the Tyrrhenian Sea were well guarded. The nearest place in this direction was Laos, close to the mouth of the river of the same name, which was long regarded as the northern boundary of Italy; farther northward lay Pyxus (Buxentum), the modern Policastro; lastly, Poseidonia also had intimate connections with Sybaris. Although communications between the two cities were kept open by the direct overland route, yet the travelling merchants had a long journey to make; they probably went by the valley of the Negro or Calore, and in general followed the line taken by the Via Popilia in Roman times. In the middle of the sixth century the extent, population, and wealth of Sybaris were very great. We are told that the city had a circumference of fifty stades, a population of one hundred thousand, and five thousand mounted men, who

took part in the festal processions. Its wealth and connection with the voluptuous Miletus led to a luxury which has become proverbial. Its inhabitants are said to have taken a regular pride in effeminacy, and in being acutely sensitive to the slightest discomfort. The rapid decline of the city proves that the faults ascribed to it really did exist, although the various anecdotes related about the Sybarites need not all be true, more particularly as they were first put in circulation only by oral tradition, which is so prone to exaggeration; but they would not have been fathered on the Sybarites had not the latter given rise to them by their mode of life, and by a certain nonchalant dandified way of boasting of their effeminacy.[6]

Croton was a complete contrast to Sybaris. In no city, Sparta only excepted, were athletics cultivated with such zeal as in Croton in the sixth century. The victories of Croton at Olympia began in 588 and continued for a long period. Its inhabitants were most celebrated for their skill in wrestling, especially Milo, who won the wrestling prize for six Olympiads in succession, 532-512, after having been previously victor in the wrestling match for youths. To win numerous victories of this kind at the Hellenic games, in contests in which success depended upon skilful and judicious training of the athlete, which implies the existence of intelligence and leisure, the whole bent of the community must have been aristocratic. This tendency was confirmed by the prolonged sojourn of the sage Pythagoras of Samos, who gave another and still higher celebrity to Croton.

Unfortunately our information about Pythagoras is very incomplete, both as regards his history and doctrine.[7] He left behind him no writings; his teaching aimed at keeping certain kinds of knowledge from the common herd; there were no historians in his age and country who might have taken an interest in recording the events connected with his life; at a later period his actions, which were for the most part imperfectly

known, were added to by his admirers—circumstances which explain why it is that we really know so little about him. One assertion, however, we can make. The more important historical characters are, the more their lives are distorted by legend; but the legend as a rule only follows the popular notion of the character in question. If we have reason to believe this idea to be the correct one, we shall be justified in considering the apocryphal anecdotes as a mere deepening of the colours of a picture which would otherwise have appeared to us less distinct. In the case of Pythagoras, however, we can do little but describe the impression made by the character of this extraordinary man. It is not known when he was born or in what year he died. His birth, however, may be roughly put between the 50th and 52nd Olympiad (580-568 B.C.). He is said to have been a pupil of Pherecydes of Syrus, who was considered the first prose-writer among the Greeks; other famous sages, such as Thales, Bias, and Anaximander, are given him as teachers; he is even said to have received instruction from the Pythia. He was a great traveller —nothing very wonderful for a Samian, whose fellow-countrymen travelled to Spain and had settlements in Egypt. Hence there is no reason to doubt that he had been in Egypt. The story of his journey to Babylon may be an invention, but is by no means improbable. In his fortieth year he is stated to have gone to Italy. The motive for this change is not recorded. We may, however, suppose that the same impulse stirred him which brought so many Greeks of the east to Italy at that time, where they hoped to find a wider scope for their activity. There was no suspicion as yet that the strength of some Italian peoples was greater even than that of the Lydians and Persians. His selection of Croton may be accounted for externally by the friendly relations which existed between that city and Samos, and internally by tendencies prevailing there. It was the home of an aristocracy, which prided itself on attaining distinction by

means of bodily strength and skill. Might they not be converted to the loftier aspirations of the intellect? Pythagoras made the attempt and succeeded. His influence was of a threefold character, that of teacher, educator, and politician; we cannot add founder of a religion, for he introduced no new religious ceremonies; his aim was merely to emphasize the meaning of the existing ones, and to bring them into closer relation to the moral conduct of life. He had, however, no desire to impart his doctrines to all without distinction. His plan consisted of separation of the educated from the ignorant, and progressive instruction in wisdom. Vindication of the dignity of woman was an important part of the Pythagorean system. The starting-point of his teaching was that the Ionic philosophers were wrong in assuming the world to be governed by a material principle. He set up an ideal one in the form of Number, that is, Order. On the one hand he studied mathematics, in which he is known to have achieved great success, while on the other hand he applied his theory of the supremacy of Number to ethics, by setting up as his main doctrine the necessity of moderation and harmony. He thus found himself in unison with the tendencies of the great men of action, who, under the designation of the Seven Wise Men, had enjoyed the highest repute in the preceding generations, and with the mind of the Greek people in general. The harmony required by Pythagoras included purity of soul as well as of body, and in this respect he supplemented the Greek religion, which officially recognized purification only in an external sense. But the Greek religion was defective in other respects also; it revealed nothing concerning the future of mankind. What the priests could not offer was sought for by sages, and their endeavours were met half-way by the longings of the people. The need for consolation felt by the soul was already partly satisfied by secret associations and mysteries; Pythagoras aimed at giving it a higher form. It is evident that Oriental philosophy had an influence on his teaching.

The immortality of the soul had already been taught by Pherecydes of Syros; it was taught also by the Egyptian religion, with the addition that mankind would be judged after death in the lower world. Pythagoras accepted this doctrine, and added to it the peculiar theory of the transmigration of the soul. The soul which fails to attain to purity must submit to being made to enter a new body. At a later period it was asserted that Pythagoras said that he himself was now living for the fifth time as a man; he is also said to have described what he had been in his former lives, and to have recognized a shield which he had borne in the Trojan war as Euphorbus. By way of mockery it was asserted that he once recognized the voice of a dead friend in the howling of a dog.[8]

Pythagoras obtained great influence with the aristocracy of Croton, whose position was strengthened by him. Milo became his disciple. The number of those initiated into the inner mysteries of his doctrine is said to have been 300; they had a community of goods. A further effect of Pythagorean influence was the general invigoration of Croton, which won a brilliant victory in the conflict with Sybaris that broke out soon afterwards.

Sybaris and Croton came originally from the same Greek country, Achaia, and in earlier times were often united. Thus they combined to attack and destroy the Colophonian colony of Siris in the first half of the sixth century B.C. The motive for this attack is not known; in the case of Sybaris we may suppose it was commercial jealousy. There are coins commemorating an alliance between Siris and Pyxus, which may indicate that Siris had intruded into a sphere which Sybaris regarded as peculiarly her own. This of course did not concern Croton, but it is possible that the latter was then under the influence of Sybaris. In any event it soon had to suffer for its share in this war. Locri had sided with Siris, and war broke out between Croton and Locri. The Rhegians supported

the Crotoniates, and the allies were far superior to the enemy in point of numbers. In spite of this the Locrians were victorious in the battle on the river Sagras. It was said that the heroes specially honoured by them, Ajax, son of Oileus, and the Dioscuri, had turned the scale. The Dioscuri, clad in red cloaks and riding white chargers, had been seen taking part in the battle. But this defeat only diminished the power of Croton, and did not break it; this was soon proved in a striking manner.[9]

In Sybaris a change of government had taken place. The aristocracy of the Thousand had been overthrown, and a popular leader, named Telys, had made himself tyrant. Five hundred noble Sybarites were exiled. They fled to Croton, and placed themselves as suppliants at the altars in the market-place. Telys was not pleased to see his opponents received so well. He demanded the surrender of the five hundred, failing which he would declare war against Croton. In this crisis the majority were at first in favour of giving them up; and the resolve to stand by them is said to have been due to Pythagoras alone. War broke out in the year 511 B.C. The superiority of Sybaris was great. She is said to have brought 300,000 men into the field. Croton could only collect a third of this number, but the pick of her troops, who were led by Milo, was as vigorous as the great mass of the Sybarites was effeminate. Previous to the battle, which was fought on the river Traeis, the omens were so unfavourable to the Sybarites that their seer, the Elean Callias, went over to the enemy. They were completely defeated, and, as is alleged, partly owing to the fact that their horses, which were trained to dance to the sound of the flute, began to dance in the battle when the Crotoniates played the tunes, and so threw the troops into disorder. The conquerors pursued the defeated army to the gates of Sybaris. A revolt broke out in the city; the people rose and slew Telys, but continued the defence, which lasted for seventy days. The city was then

taken. The Crotoniates razed it to the ground; they even changed the course of the Crathis, and made it flow in a new channel through the city, to prevent its ever being rebuilt.[10] Many Sybarites fled to the colonies of Sybaris on the Tyrrhenian Sea, to Laos and Scidros among others, perhaps also to Poseidonia. There was a great panic among all who were connected with Sybaris; the distress was greatest in Miletus. The treatment of Sybaris by Croton is hard to excuse, and can only be accounted for by a long-standing and intense animosity against Sybaris. Commercial rivalry, and the close relations existing between Sybaris and Miletus on the one hand, and between Croton and Samos on the other, must have had something to do with it. In any case it brought Croton no good. Great discontent soon showed itself. The lower classes became disaffected. They had helped to win the victory, and were entitled to demand an improvement in their political position. They were determined not to be kept in leading-strings by the aristocracy. The latter, however, would not yield; theoretical wisdom refused to take the course dictated by political prudence. A certain Cylon placed himself at the head of the malcontents; their plan consisted of a change in the constitution, election of the council by popular vote, official responsibility, and division of the territory of Sybaris among the people. The council of the Thousand rejected these demands, and the result was an insurrection, directed chiefly against the Pythagoreans, who were the flower of the aristocracy. They were, it is said, assembled in the house of Milo, when it was surrounded and a great number of them killed. Pythagoras was not among the latter; he proceeded to Metapontum, which became for some time the headquarters of the brotherhood. But here also the people rose against them. It is expressly stated that the houses of the Pythagorean societies in the towns of Lower Italy were burned, and that their meeting-house at Metapontum was also set on fire, two young athletes only being able to make their escape. We

are further told that in consequence of this party struggle, the cities were filled with disturbances and bloodshed. In Croton Cylon's party could not have remained long in possession of the government, for it is recorded that the nobles again obtained power, that members of the popular party were exiled, and that subsequently a certain Cleinias made himself tyrant by the aid of that party and some armed slaves, and put to death or banished the leading men. The exact date of these occurrences cannot be determined; no important events in the historical times of Greece are so little known as those which took place in Magna Graecia during this period. Croton still retained its interest in athletics, but from that time slowly declined in power and importance.

In Croton philosophy endeavoured to influence the conduct of life in general. It had failed to master the various conflicting elements, yet the violent reaction was unable to stifle the germs which in later ages bore healthy fruit. Pythagoreanism continued to exist, especially as a system of philosophy, then as a rule of conduct, and finally with some influence on civic life. The practical side of the Pythagorean teaching made itself repeatedly felt in the fourth century. The Pythagoreans then appear as the opponents of the tyrant Dionysus; the Pythagorean Lysis becomes the teacher of Epaminondas; and we find the Pythagorean Archytas for many years the wise and revered ruler of the Tarentine state. The Pythagorean philosophy was successful in turning promising individuals into able and energetic citizens—more so perhaps than the Platonic—but it was not able to create a political system endued with a permanent power of resistance.

The second great philosopher who came from Ionia to Magna Graecia in the sixth century B.C., Xenophanes of Colophon, was a great contrast to the imposing figure of Pythagoras. Little is known of his life. He travelled about the world like a man who was obliged to live by some profession. His was the art of poetry, but his verses were

intended to serve for instruction and not for amusement. He stayed at different places in Sicily, as late as the fifth century B.C. ; but he seems to have lived at Elea for choice.

Xenophanes expounded in elegiac verse his views concerning the errors inherent in popular ideas. His theoretical philosophy was contained in a poem upon nature. He asserted that the divinity was one, and identical with the universe. He thus became the founder of the Eleatic school. At the same time he did not neglect the study of nature ; he devoted some attention to fossils and volcanoes. But the impression which he made on the great bulk of his contemporaries was due only to his criticism of popular notions. He upheld the proposition that man creates gods in his own image ; he regretted that so much importance was attached to athletics, greater than to virtue and wisdom ; he had no great opinion of the accuracy of human knowledge, but he recognized the possibility of progress. He is the pure critic as opposed to the dogmatist Pythagoras, and both are equally original characters. The inhabitants of the cities of Magna Graecia in those days had ample opportunity of cultivating new and important branches of knowledge, and of enjoying intercourse with gifted foreigners.

In poetry, which aims more at beauty than at instruction, the cities about the Straits of Messina were more distinguished than those which were the scenes of Pythagoras' work, or than Elea. Here were the homes of Charondas and Zaleucus, in Sicily the cities reaching from Himera to Catana, in Lower Italy Rhegium with Locri on the right and its colonies on the left. From the Locrian Mataurus on the Tyrrhenian Sea came the family of the poet Stesichorus, who was born at Himera, and lived between 640-556 B.C. He wrote epic poetry in lyrical form. He gave the finishing touch to the artistic construction of the ode by adding the epode to the strophe and antistrophe. He became specially famous from the story of his blindness. He lost his sight because he had attacked

Helena in one of his poems, but recovered it on retracting his invective in another: this is the origin of palinode as a proverbial expression. Stesichorus was also an erotic poet. In this branch he found a successor in Ibycus of Rhegium in the second half of the sixth century, whose name has become better known by his death at the hand of a robber than by his works.

We have already referred to the fine arts of the west.

NOTES

1. For the influence of Cyme, cf. F. von Duhn, Grundzüge einer Gesch. Campaniens in the Verh. d. Philol.-Vers. in Trier 1879.

2. For Zaleucus Ar. quoted in Schol. Pind. Ol. 11, 17 (Müll. fr. 230); Eph. quoted in Str. 6, 260; Demosth. c. Timocr. 139 seq. Zaleucus and Charondas have been frequently confused by the ancients. Cf. Herm. St. A. § 88, 89. The date, acc. to Eusebius, was the 29th Olympiad, upon which little stress can be laid, as it is the result of the usual arrangement of chronology; Zaleucus was placed forty years earlier than Draco. Cf. Busolt, G. G. I. 276, who may safely be referred to for anything connected with Zaleucus.

3. For Charondas, cf. Holm, Gesch. Sic. im Alterth. I. 153 seq.

4. For Panaetius, Holm, G. Sic. I. 153.

5. For Phalaris, Holm, Gesch. Sic. I. 149 seq.

6. The stories about Sybaris are much on a level with those of Miletus. Many of them remind us of modern anecdotes, in which one talker caps the stories of another; the humour in the Sybaritic anecdotes is not always noticed.

7. For Pythagoras, besides earlier writings, cf. Krische, De societatis a Pythagora cond. scopo polit. Gött. 1830; Zeller in Pauly's R. Enc. VI. 1, and in his Geschichte der Philos. der Griechen; Röth, Gesch. der Philos. II. (who relies too much on tradition); Rathgeber, Grossgriechenland und Pythagoras (of interest for the bibliography). The principal authority is Iamblichus, as to whom cf. Rohde, Die Quellen des Iamblichus (esp. Nicomachus with additions by Apollonius) in the Rh. Mus. XXVI. and XXVII. Recently G. F. Unger, Zur Geschichte der Pythagoreer, Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss. 1883, has endeavoured to fix the chronology of Pythagoras as follows:—Pythagoras was born about 568, appeared as teacher in Samos about 532, was sent by Polycrates to Amasis, went to Croton

and thence in 509 to Metapontum, where he died about 493. Unger has also written on the chronology of Xenophanes' life, Philologus, 1884.

8. The eastern origin of the Pythagorean doctrines has been often asserted, but is attributed to very different places. Cf. A. Gladisch, Einleitung in das Verständniss der Weltgeschichte I. Die alten Schinesen und die Pythagoreer, Posen 1841 ; L. von Schröder, Pythagoras und die Inder, Lpz. 1884. Pythagoreanism has often been associated with Egypt. M. Cantor discusses the studies of Pythagoras in the East from the point of view of exact science, Mathematische Beiträge zum Culturleben der Völker, Halle, 1863. And see his article Arithmetica in Pauly's R.E., 2nd ed. I. 1704 seq., according to which the arithmetic of the Greeks can be understood, "if we admit the truth of the accounts which state that Pythagoras first made himself perfect master of the methods of geometry in Egypt, and then studied arithmetic in Babylon about 500 B.C."

9. The date of the battle on the Sagras must be before 556 B.C. if the palinode of Stesichorus is contemporary with it (G. Sic. I. 167).

10. For the inundation contrived by the Crotoniates with a view to the complete destruction of Sybaris, see Cavallari in the Notizie degli Scavi (Lincei), Rome, 1879.

CHAPTER XXVI

ATHENS UP TO THE TIME OF SOLON. LEGISLATION OF SOLON

Our wanderings through Greek antiquity bring us finally to Athens.[1] After the earliest mythical age, which has left no tangible traces save in monuments of art, we witnessed the rise of genuine Greek culture on Asiatic soil, in the form of the Homeric poems. In Europe we watched the growth of the rigid organism of the Spartan state, and noted that the political development of the rest of Greece followed a more natural course, in its transition from a simple and strict to a more elaborate and more liberal form of constitution, its progress receiving certain checks under the personal rule of the tyrants. We saw how culture for a time had its abode in Asia even after the Homeric age, how the Greeks subsequently spread over well-nigh every shore of the eastern and central Mediterranean, and how finally, when Hellenism was threatened in Asia, they devoted their energies more than ever to the colonization of the west, which both from a material and intellectual point of view began to prove a serious rival of Asia Minor. But all this is far from exhausting the achievements of Greece before the commencement of the fifth century B.C. Athens still remains, which was about to leave its mark upon the whole nation, and in the sixth century at any rate was inferior to no other Greek community in intrinsic importance.

We know little more of Attica in early times than we do of Argos or Boeotia. The legends of Cecrops and Erechtheus, of Pandion, Aegeus and Theseus have as little historical value as those of Danaus, Heracles, Perseus or Oedipus, perhaps even less, for the reason that they originated in the country which in literature stood at the head of Greece. The glorification of his native land was the darling theme of every Greek, and the Greek race which displayed the most literary activity was also the most fertile in inventions of this description. Two assertions, however, connected with one another, which were made by the Athenians, are of historical importance, firstly, that they were autochthones, and secondly, that many Greeks from other countries had taken refuge in Attica, which had never been conquered, but had always welcomed all strangers in need of protection.[2] Thus Oedipus had found an asylum in Attica, as did the Heraclidae; and Orestes was purified from his guilt there. These heroes founded no families in Attica; this was left among others to the descendants of Neleus, notably Melanthus, the great-great-grandson of the brother of Nestor and father of Codrus, some members of whose family remained in Athens, while another branch led the Ionians into Asia; also to the ancestors of the Paeonidae, alleged to be descendants of Antilochus, the eldest son of Nestor, and to the Alcmaeonidae, who were descended from Thrasymedes, the second son of the Pylian hero, and lastly, to the family of the tyrant Peisistratus, whose ancestor was the youngest son of the old Nestor, and namesake of Peisistratus. It cannot of course be asserted that because certain Nelidae are said to have migrated to Attica, people must really have come from Pylos to Athens. But from a general point of view it is highly probable that many strangers came to Attica in very early times and remained there. Attica is a corner of Greece, which by reason of its rocky soil is not exactly a tempting district for settlers, if anything better is at hand. But its very character of a corner

cut off from the great highways makes it probable that bands of men who had been driven out of their way often settled there. Moreover, in Attica we do not find the same pronounced distinction between rulers and ruled as in Thessaly and a great part of the Peloponnese, a class distinction which is a mark of former conquest by more powerful foreigners. This vouches for the assertion that it was never conquered in the sense in which Thessaly, Argos, Sparta and Messenia were conquered, but that it was peopled by isolated bands, who at first were politically distinct from one another, but afterwards united. Hence the Athenians could say that they were autochthones, that is, that their ancestors were neither conquered nor conquerors, but had come into the country in separate groups and without much warfare, and they could also say that they had always welcomed strangers, for they were all of them strangers in the beginning.

Thus it is not improbable that some of the Athenians were descended from people who had fled from the Peloponnese before the Dorians. Athens was the chief representative of the Ionic race in European Greece.[3] Attica has but few fertile plains: that of Marathon in the east, that of Eleusis in the west, and lastly, that of Athens. Heracles was an object of special worship in Marathon, Demeter in Eleusis, and Pallas Athene in Athens. Here the centre of the settlement was formed by the rock of the Acropolis, a portion of the rising ground overlooking the valley, the northern part of which is watered by the Cephisus, and the southern by the less important Ilissus. This elevation runs north-east and south-west, and reaches a height of 900 feet above the city in the hill of Lycabettus, while to the south-west of the Acropolis it is prolonged in a lower ridge, the most important summit of which was called Museion in antiquity. It is on this last-mentioned ridge and in its ravines that traces of very ancient settlements have been found. But they have no importance in history. This is monopolized by the settlement on the

Acropolis (500 feet above the level of the sea), which being isolated on all sides was admirably adapted for defence. One of the many Attic communities existed here in very early times, and became the political centre of the whole of Attica even in pre-historic ages. Theseus is credited with having brought about this union. The most precise description of the change then accomplished is given by Thucydides. At first, he says, every Attic community was autonomous, some even waged war against each other, as Erechtheus of Athens and Eumolpus of Eleusis. Theseus united them; he dissolved the deliberative assembly of each community, but left a council and a Prytaneum in Athens which henceforth served for all. In antiquity this was called a *sunoikismos*, and, according to Thucydides, was the origin of the festival of the Synoecia in Athens.[4] It was even asserted that the Prytaneum was established in the citadel itself, that the sacrifice of the Panathenaea was instituted then, and that the name Athenae was given to the enlarged precincts which, according to Thucydides, included chiefly the districts to the south of the citadel.[5]

It is a very remarkable fact that from early times there was no united state in Greece of such large extent as Attica. Sparta is the solitary exception, but Spartan rule was upheld simply by unremitting compulsion. Athens was the only example in Greece of a state not founded on force and yet more than a mere city, or rather it was the only city in possession of a territory, the inhabitants of which could not all take refuge within the walls of the citadel a couple of hours after the warning of the approach of an enemy. The importance of this distinction between Athens and the other Greek states is not always kept in view; and yet it was one of the germs of the future greatness of the city. This peculiarity of Athens produced at an early date a feeling of security in political matters among its citizens, which was the origin of that consciousness of belonging to a great state which is so marked in later times. Of the other cities of

Attica only one could compete with Athens in internal importance, Eleusis, which for this very reason held a position apart. Eleusis yielded to Athens only after a struggle; and then its religious honours became all the greater and made up for the loss of its political independence. The cause of the supremacy of Athens over all the other places in the country must be sought in its natural advantages. Athens alone united strength of position with comparatively fertile surroundings and the proximity of good harbours. We may conclude that the consciousness of these advantages was always present to the minds of the inhabitants of Attica, and it is quite possible that an able chieftain may at a favourable moment have taken advantage of this feeling and of the position generally in order to make Athens the actual seat of government for the whole country. In this way, without the employment of much force, a state was early formed, unique of its kind, which for Greece may be called a large one. This must have made Athens the only worthy rival of the great military state of Sparta. At a later period this rivalry led it to resort to force against its own so-called allies, which was the cause of its ruin.

The concentration of the inhabitants of Attica into a city, referred to by ancient writers, cannot of course be taken in a literal sense.[6] Only the wealthiest could possess a town house which they occasionally inhabited;[7] otherwise only those who belonged to the various districts, which now formed the city, lived within its walls. But in Athens it is said there were places of assembly for all in the so-called Leschae,[8] the number of which, 360, is easily explained. The whole Attic population had been from time immemorial divided into four phylae, each of these into three phratriae, and each phratria into thirty tribes; and originally even the number of the heads of families in each tribe is said to have been fixed at thirty. It is not easy to explain these divisions. We know the names of the four phylae which are designated

as Ionic, and appear in other Ionic cities, Geleontes, Hopletes, Aegicores, and Argades. Three of these names explain themselves: armour-bearers, goat-herds, and artizans; the name Geleontes may also denote some calling connected with the soil (*ge*). But it is impossible for the phylae to have been caste divisions. Was it a local classification? We do not know the original meaning of the names, nor what constituted the difference between them in later times.[9] It is also by no means clear what connection the phylae had with the ancient Attic division into the three ranks or classes of Eupatridae, Geomori or Georgi and Demiurgi, which are ascribed to Theseus. Were there Eupatridae, Geomori and Demiurgi in each phyle? Did the three phratriae of each separate phyle include members from these three classes? Or were the Eupatridae confined to the Ionic phylae? The probability is that persons not belonging to the nobility were always members of the phylae in Attica.

The political constitution of Athens, that is to say, its form of government, underwent little change in the course of centuries, and then only by a slow and gradual process. It is true that tradition speaks of sharply-defined periods. Monarchy prevails up to the death of Codrus. Then comes a republic (about 1069), and an archon takes the place of a king as chief magistrate, but the office is for life, and the choice restricted to the family of Codrus.[10] In the year 752 the term of office of the archons was reduced to ten years; in 712 the Medontidae were deprived of their privilege of appointing the archon from their own ranks, and the office was thrown open to all the Eupatridae. In 683, according to received accounts, an important change was made, nine archons being elected instead of one, with a term of office of a year only. According to the newly-discovered treatise of Aristotle the increase in the number took place gradually; after the Basileus came the Polemarch, and later the six Thesmothetae. In opposition to this generally-received account,

statements of ancient writers have recently been quoted in support of the assertion that the republic did not come in with Medon, but that the monarchy was continued even in the decennial archonship. For of the nine who held office for a year the second, it is said, retained the title of Basileus. In this discrepancy between tradition and science the truth can be ascertained by a consideration of early Greek history in general. The question is simply one of names, and the solution is obvious. It was the conviction of the ancients that the death of Codrus and the accession of Medon marked the commencement of an important chapter in Athenian constitutional history. Medon and his successors, it was asserted, were more dependent upon the nobility than their predecessors had been, and this view, which allows us to assume that the title of king still remained, really corresponds with the subsequent history of Attica down to the seventh century B.C. During this period Attica is so tranquil that her annals are a blank. This indicates the rule of a landed nobility, who live comfortably upon the revenues of their property and have no wish to interfere in foreign quarrels. The chief, whether he were called king or not, was only the instrument of the nobles. The contest between sham monarchy and aristocracy, which divided the ruling classes in the heroic age, had disappeared ; the monarchy is reduced to a mere form, and aristocracy has gained a decisive victory. The real power therefore was in the hands of the nobles, who allowed their chief magistrate to retain the harmless title of king.[11] There being records of so many centuries of Attic history, we know who the leading families in the country were, and their title to nobility. And it is interesting to note these points, as they are a contribution to our knowledge of the views of the inhabitants of the first Greek city.[12] The Daedalidae were descended from Erechtheus, the Butadae, who had charge of the Erechtheum (Lycurgus, the statesman of the fourth century belonged to them) from a brother of

Erechtheus. The Buzygae, sprung from the hero Buzyges, to which family Pericles belonged, had to perform, as their name denotes, a solemn ceremony of the plough. The ancestor of the Phytalidae, the priests of Zeus Meilichius, was a hero named Phytalus, who had entertained Demeter on her wanderings. Of priestly races, descended from a mysterious ancestry, there were the Lycomidae, Hesychidae and Centriadae; in the last of these we see the origin of the name, their function being to drive a bull before them at the festival of Dipolia with a goad (*kentron*) to the altar. The Ceryces, to whom the wealthy Callias and Hipponicus[13] belonged, and the Daduchi, whose names denote their office of heralds and torch-bearers in the service of Demeter, must of course be descended from Hermes, the god of heralds; their ancestress was Aglaurus, daughter of Cecrops. Of Eleusinian race were the Eumolpidae, descendants of King Eumolpus, or according to others, of Triptolemus. From Ajax, son of Telamon, and through him from Zeus were descended the Eurysacidae, to whom Alcibiades belonged, and the Philaidae, from whom came Hippocleides, who appeared as a suitor at Sicyon, and also Miltiades. The Coronidae and Peirithoidae were descended from the fabulous Lapithae in Thessaly. The Gephyraeans, to whom Harmodius and Aristogeiton belonged, were Cadmeans from Thebes; according to Herodotus, they themselves claimed to have come from Eretria. Finally the Medontidae (Solon, Critias), the Alcmaeonidae and the Peisistratidae were of Pylian extraction.

The Eupatridae were the only members of the Athenian state who had full civic rights. The officials, notably the archons, were chosen from among them (according to Aristotle vacancies in the ranks of the archons were filled by the Areopagus); they were originally the only students and interpreters of the laws, and stewards of the divine ceremonies. Ignorance of the unwritten law made the other Athenians particularly dependent on the nobles. When power was entrusted to the

nine archons, the functions of the first archon, or archon eponymus, were confined to presiding over the collegium and administering justice, for the two other functions of the ancient kings, the headship of the priesthood and the supreme command in time of war, had been conferred on the two archons next in rank, the Basileus and the Polemarch. The others were called simply law-givers (*thesmothetae*), by which title they were denoted generally as persons invested with power over the people to the extent prescribed by their customary rights.[14] How the nobles exercised a control over the archons, or whether there existed a senate or council of state, we do not know.[15] Probably the Areopagus alone possessed this control. Certain tribunals which decided criminal cases were very ancient. Cases of wilful murder were tried by the court of the Areopagus, other homicides by those of the Palladium, the Delphinium, the Phreatto, and the Prytaneum. Only the relatives of the murdered person were allowed to appear as prosecutors, but it was the duty of the phrateres, or members of the phratria, to support them. Thus in this respect also a closer union was promoted among the citizens.

That there were constant endeavours to change the constitution at Athens is proved by the gradual remodelling of the archonship. But at that time the movement was confined to the noble classes. Yet Athens also was destined to see the time when the demos would feel its power and claim a share in the government. And this did not happen for the first time during the life of Solon. There was popular agitation as early as the seventh century. The first result of it was merely an attempt at revolt, which ended in a tyranny. The leader of the movement was Cylon, a young man, who had won the wreath for the foot-race at Olympia, and was son-in-law of Theagenes, tyrant of Megara.[16] He also managed to obtain religious protection in the form of an utterance of the Pythia, which was of course explained away as having been misinterpreted

when the plot failed. At the time of the Olympic festival—the Pythia had indicated the greatest festival of Zeus as the favourable moment, and the Delphic priests asserted afterwards that he should have chosen the greatest Athenian festival of Zeus, the Diasia—Cylon made himself master of the Acropolis of Athens, with the assistance of some of his father-in-law's troops, probably about the year 630 B.C. It was perhaps the presence of the Megarian mercenaries which made the Athenians look with such abhorrence on the attempt in which Peisistratus afterwards succeeded. Cylon was blockaded in the citadel. The Alcmaeonid Megacles, a man of great energy, was archon at the time. Under his directions the blockade of the citadel was continued; Cylon's partisans suffered hunger and thirst, while Cylon himself disappeared, leaving his misguided followers to their fate, which was sad enough. On their distress becoming greater, they withdrew into the temple of Athene, where they were inviolable. They obtained a promise that they might depart unharmed, and left the citadel. Megacles, however, put them all to death, even those who had fled to the sanctuary of the venerable goddesses, the Eumenides. The suppression of the revolt against the constitution was accomplished, but a dark stain of blood-guiltiness attached to the Athenians, which is said to have been afterwards imperfectly removed by Epimenides of Crete. Another result of the fall of Cylon was a quarrel with Megara, which led to a war. Before this, however, the abuses arising out of the uncertainty of the law made themselves felt in Athens, and the introduction of a written code, especially of criminal law, seemed a matter of necessity. This reform was effected by the archon Draco in 621 B.C.[17] The old Attic common law was severe, and when it was reduced to writing its severity appeared more distinctly; this is why what we know of the Draconian legislation bears the stamp of cruelty, and how it was said to be inscribed in characters of blood. Draco's laws are connected

with the institution of the Ephetae—the judges of life and death. Their number was fifty-one. We do not know, however, whether he did not find them already in existence.

But even this legislation (presented in quite a new light by Aristotle's constitution of Athens, upon which I have commented in the notes) did not put an end to the popular discontent; it appears rather to have heightened it, by showing the people plainly what severe punishment awaited those who laid hands not on the life but only on the property of others. The penalty in every case was death. And yet want might easily drive people to theft. For the real cause of the discontent was the cruel poverty of the majority of the Athenians, who moreover were not always successful in their foreign undertakings. It is true that, at this time or a little later, they achieved a success which must be mentioned here. About the year 600 B.C. they occupied Sigeium, a town built on a promontory commanding the entrance to the Hellespont. But this was Aeolian territory, and it was the duty of the Mitylenaeans not to tolerate such a usurpation. They built the stronghold of Achilleium close by, and the struggle was maintained with varying success. Finally Periander settled the dispute by deciding in favour of the maintenance of the *status quo*, and Athens retained Sigeium.[18] There is something very peculiar about the origin of this fortress. Sigeium was not an ordinary Greek colony, that is, a branch detached from the parent stem. It was a citadel in a foreign country, a colony after the Roman fashion. It was about a hundred and eighty miles from Athens as the crow flies, almost as far as from Athens to Crete. We imagine that no other Greek city possessed a fortress at so great a distance unprotected by other regular colonies in the neighbourhood. And Athens had no such colonies, in fact she had none in the Greek sense of the word, which is also remarkable. The objection that the Ionic cities in Asia, especially Miletus, were colonies of Athens does not hold good, for the connection is a legendary

one. When Corinth, Megara, Rhodes and Miletus were founding colonies, Athens took no part in the movement. On the other hand it built this fortress on a distant shore, and managed to defend it against powerful rivals living in the immediate neighbourhood. The fact is that the Athenians wished to concentrate their strength; the states which founded colonies exhausted it. Athens declined to follow this course; she intended to remain powerful and able to make her power felt at a distance. And Athens possessed exceptional aptitudes for playing this part in the extent of her territory, which was unique as compared with that of other Greek states, and in the absence of the two classes of oppressors and oppressed in her population. To appear in such force on the Hellespont, Athens must not only have had a powerful fleet, but also a strong base of operations in that neighbourhood, and this may be attributed to her close connection with Miletus, which showed a marked attachment to the parent city at various epochs of the history of Athens. This explains how Athens, from a distance of a hundred and eighty miles, could despatch so many troops to the Hellespont, that the Mitylenaeans, who had only a ten miles' voyage from Lesbos to the continent, were unable to dislodge them. It was in this way that Athens underwent early preparation for her glorious but hazardous career as head of a confederacy in the fifth and fourth centuries.[19]

Close at home, however, the Athenians were less successful. They lost the island of Salamis, which certainly is nearer the coast of Megara than that of Attica, but was of exceptional importance to Athens, because it commanded the maritime trade of an important section of Attic territory. Without Salamis Athens ceased to be an important state. Attempts to regain it resulted in failure, and the leaders of Athenian politics so completely lost heart, it is said, that they made it an offence punishable with death to propose a renewal of war for the purpose of recovering Salamis. The disgrace attaching

to this decree was felt by none more keenly than by Solon, the son of Exechestides, of the family of the Medontidae.[20] He appeared one day in the people's assembly with his head covered, as though he were just returned from a journey, and recited a poem in elegiac verse, stating that he had come as a herald from Salamis, that the Athenians should no longer endure the ignominy which reduced their country to the level of small and thinly-populated islands like Sicinos and Pholegandros: "Up, up!" he cried, "haste and reconquer Salamis!" It was said that he behaved like a madman to escape the penalty; if it were madness, it was that of a Pythian priestess. The Athenians allowed 500 volunteers to venture on the enterprise. The attack was evidently well planned, and was executed with rapidity, and Salamis was taken. If Athens was able to appear in such force in the Hellespont about the same time—600 B.C.—we should be inclined to think that her attitude towards Megara was determined not so much by despondency as by prudence.

She had, however, other difficulties of an entirely different nature to overcome. The guilt of blood incurred by the action of Megacles weighed heavily on the citizens. The sacrificial auguries remained unfavourable. Megacles ought to have undergone some punishment, but he refused to do so. Once more Solon came to the rescue. He persuaded Megacles to submit to the decision of 300 nobles.[21] Their sentence was mild enough. The archons who had offended were exiled. The next step was to expiate the desecration of the sanctuaries and the guilt of the country in general. For this purpose the Cretan Epimenides, a man of special renown in these matters, is said to have been sent for. The ceremonies prescribed by him had the desired effect, and the people were pacified. The altars of the Erinnyes, which had been polluted by the murder, were consecrated afresh; from the Areopagus animals were driven forth over the whole country, and wherever they lay down were sacrificed to the god of the

locality. Epimenides refused the talent of silver offered him as a reward, and took nothing but a twig from the sacred olive of Athens.[22]

But if the people were pacified they were not contented. Their social condition was wretched. The lower classes had fallen into a dangerous state of poverty, the result of certain defects in the legal system, the development of which had not kept pace with that of business. The law of debt was too severe, and the nobles and wealthy classes enforced it without compunction. The poor often required a loan because they had no corn for seed. They mortgaged their land, and the stone pillars erected on it were public evidence of the existence of the debt. It was no easy matter to repay the borrowed capital, and default was often made in the payment of the interest, the rate of which was at least ten per cent.; the creditor charged compound interest, and very soon became owner of the land. When this took place the wealthy creditor generally appears to have left the man who had been thus ousted from his property in charge as manager, but then only on the most stringent conditions.[23] But this was not the worst; other laws relating to debt were enforced. The person of an insolvent debtor was security for his debt. The creditor could use him as a slave or sell him into foreign lands. This state of things is instructive in two ways. In the first place we have fresh confirmation of the fact that there were no really privileged classes, no landed proprietors and Perioeci in Attica, for a regular impoverishment of the poor by the rich does not take place under a feudal system; and in the second place, we note that the Athenian policy of abstaining from colonization had its awkward side. In other Greek states outcasts of this description would have sought their fortune beyond the seas.

These abuses inspired Solon with a desire for reform. The people also conceived the idea that he might be their saviour. What he had done hitherto showed that he not only wished

to do good, but that he also had the gift of winning people over to his ideas. He was of noble birth, but not very wealthy, and had travelled a great deal in his youth, probably as a merchant. He stood in every way above parties. Many even began to think that he ought, under some form or other, to become ruler of the state. The Delphic oracle was enlisted in the service of this idea. So far as it ever could speak unambiguously, it called on Solon to assume the *tyrannis*. On this occasion perhaps even the aristocracy would have favoured such a course, since the position and character of Solon were sufficient guarantees that he would act fairly towards all parties, and he had, moreover, as it appears, no descendants.[24] But Solon had no ambition to become tyrant. He declared that the state merely required new laws. He was elected first archon for the year 594 B.C. (Ol. 46, 3), with the special functions of conciliator and framer of new laws.[25] Conciliation could only be practically effected by giving relief to debtors, and by abolishing liability of the person, in other words, slavery as a consequence of debt.

Ancient writers, however, are not agreed as to the details of these reforms. According to some accounts all money debts were cancelled, according to others the interest only was reduced, and the value of the currency was altered by making 73 drachmae legal tender for the mina instead of 100. In other words, each debtor received a remission of 27 per cent. of his debt. This would not have necessitated the issue of a fresh currency. Yet it is remarkable that the fall from 100 to 73 nearly corresponds to the ratio between the Aeginetan and Euboic stater, and thus we may assume[26] that it was Solon who discarded the Aeginetan in favour of the Euboic standard, which Corinth also adopted, and which became so widely used afterwards through the instrumentality of Athens. No change was made as regards landed property; a redistribution, which many had doubtless hoped for, not being introduced.[27] Solon himself gave up five or perhaps as many as

fifteen talents which he had lent out at interest. He also decreed that no one should acquire land beyond a certain limit. Unfortunately the limit is unknown to us. All these measures—the reduction of the rate of interest, the remission of a portion of the debt, the abolition of enslavement for debt, and the fixing of a maximum for the purchase of landed property—formed what the Athenians called the Seisachtheia, or shaking off of burdens. But they were more in the nature of a palliative for present abuses than a prevention of future ones. For the latter a new code of laws was necessary.

The Solonian legislation was based on the political theory prevailing at that time that an aristocracy with limited power was the best form of government. Low birth could not justify exclusion from voting upon public affairs; but universal political equality was not considered advisable. The idea of making property the sole qualification for political rights was already current. But as a rule the principle of timocracy would seem to have been carried out in an unsatisfactory manner; wealth simply took the place of rank, a change which is not always for the better. So long as there were two sharply-divided classes, class-hatred was possible, and permanent reconciliation out of the question. Solon endeavoured to make the predominance of the propertied classes in the state bearable by introducing a scale of qualifications, descending from the highest to the lowest, and by making the burdens strictly proportionate to the privileges. The new law established four classes of citizens, as according to Aristotle was the case already in the time of Draco.[28] To the first class belonged those whose property brought in a yearly return of upwards of 500 bushels of corn (barley), or a similar quantity of wine, the Pentacosiomedimni. The second class, who were called Knights, comprised those who had an income of not less than 300 of the same measures, and the third those who had not less than 200; the latter were called Zeugitae, because they tilled the

land with a single span of draught animals. The fourth class (Thetes) included all those whose income fell below this, or who had no landed property. Taxation was assessed according to property, which did not mean much, as there was no regular taxation in Athens, and an Eisphora was demanded only in exceptional cases. Political rights were conferred on the same principle. The fourth class was exempt from taxation, but excluded from all state offices; they could only take part in the decisions of the popular assembly and of the legal tribunals. The first class had the privilege of being alone qualified for the archonship. Solon restored the council of the Areopagus to its old importance. His intention was that it should supervise the whole state. But in what manner? When might they exercise their veto? Did the veto extend to all the decisions of the state authorities? On these points we are quite in the dark. It would seem that the Athenians themselves in later times were no wiser, and that the vagueness of the functions of the Areopagus, combined with the rarity of their exercise, gave it a position of special importance. We moderns at all events can descry nothing but a general prestige, the brilliance of which obscures every detail connected with it. In its composition this council had a certain resemblance to the Roman senate; but the existence of another council created by Solon shows that the likeness was a purely external one. From each of the four phylae a hundred members were selected, whose functions were to discuss beforehand every resolution which the authorities had to propose to the people. According to Aristotle, Draco had created a council of 401 members. Aristotle in express terms assigns to the popular assembly merely the power of passing judgment on the conduct of officials and of electing them; but it must have had the right to vote on such matters for instance as a declaration of war or the conclusion of peace.

A considerable extension of the rights of the people was

effected by Solon's creation of a popular court of justice, called Heliaea, of which all citizens of a certain age were members, and to which an appeal lay in certain cases from the decision of the archons. A very important innovation was the enactment permitting testamentary disposition of property in cases of childlessness; hitherto the next-of-kin had inherited. Solon also promulgated a number of decrees regulating the life of the community in general. He was desirous of raising the moral condition of the citizens. His aims were therefore similar to those of the ancient legislators Zaleucus and Charondas. We have much information regarding the extent of the penalties fixed for certain offences—fines in money, confiscation of property, banishment, deprivation of civic rights, and death. Solon also made sumptuary laws. It is true that we are not told that he opposed the excessive expenditure of the Athenian men on dress and ornaments, but women were only allowed to take with them, when they went out of doors, three garments, a basket not exceeding a yard in length, and an obol's worth of food and drink; they were not to leave their houses at night except in a chariot and with an escort of torches. The enactments relating to morals were of a very strict nature, which does not speak well for the Athenians. Reverence for parents and the fulfilment of duties towards them could under certain circumstances be enforced by law. Property was to be kept as much as possible in the family; the courts could entertain complaints of wasting the family estate. A father could dispose by will of the hand of his daughters; if only one daughter were left unmarried at the father's death, the nearest relation might claim her hand in order to keep the property in the family; he was even obliged to marry her if no one else came forward, and if he refused, had to give her a dowry corresponding to his own station in life. Solon enacted elaborate provisions for the protection of boundaries, the preservation of plantations of trees, and for checking the exportation of products, which could

be of use to the Athenians themselves. Work was so emphatically required by Solon from every citizen as to give rise to the assertion that he imposed the penalty of death for idleness. If the Athenians wished to thrive on their stony soil, it was absolutely necessary for them to devote every energy to industry and commerce in the struggle for life. According to Solon's ideas every industrious worker was to be respected. It is indisputable that this had always been the prevailing sentiment in Athens; a man like Solon may give a more vigorous impulse to the course of public life, but cannot alter its direction. And this must also have been the case with education; in this department, too, Solon only emphasized the general tendencies of the age. All citizens were required to have their children taught. The grammatists taught reading and writing; the citharist gave instruction in music combined with moral and religious teaching; the development of physique was attended to in the gymnasiums. On attaining the age of puberty, the young men had to perform the duties of country police and of guardians of the frontier from their eighteenth to their twentieth year; not till then did they become members of the community and of the civic army. A peculiar law emanating from Solon was to the effect that whoever failed to take a side in times of public strife should lose his civic rights, a strange piece of legislation, not on account of the idea, which expresses the perfectly correct proposition that want of public spirit does the state the greatest possible harm, but because a law of this kind could never be carried out in practice, and of course never was enforced.

The value of the Solonian legislation from a practical point of view lies chiefly in its liberation of the citizens from the oppression of the wealthy classes, and from the restrictions of family ties, as in the case of the laws of inheritance; hence its importance was more of a social than a political nature. There is also an ideal side to Solon's reforms, an expression

of the nobler aspirations of the educated classes at the beginning of the sixth century B.C., the men who set before them the wellbeing of their fellow-citizens, upright conduct and piety as their aim in life, which they hoped to attain by means of a mild and well-ordered government of the poorer by the richer classes. It was legislation worthy of the age of the Seven Wise Men. And we may suppose that, taking it as a whole, the noble spirit which permeated it continued to exercise an influence for good even in the times when the political constitution established by Solon had become an empty name under Peisistratus and his sons. As is so often the case, the most carefully-devised guarantees proved a failure, but the spirit which pervaded the whole continued to work on in silence. This is why Solon has always remained one of the most revered and beloved of the leading men in Greece. His personality is rendered more complete by his being also a poet and a philosopher. His poems, which are in elegiac metre, give expression to his political and social ideas. They portray the wise man, who enjoys life, but is under no illusion as to its true value, and refrains from every species of exaggeration. His high admiration for ancient poetry is proved by the fact that he provided for the proper public recital of the Homeric poems in Athens. On the other hand, he is said to have had no taste in his old age for the drama which was then rising into prominence.

The carrying out of the new legislation must have occupied several years. During this period Athens had also to turn her attention to foreign affairs. We have already noticed that it was at Solon's instigation that Athens took a prominent part in the Sacred War,[29] and that she was able to protect her position on the Hellespont. She had also repeated struggles with Megara for the possession of Salamis. Solon had recovered Salamis, but it was reconquered by Megara. The definitive re-conquest of the island seems to have been brought about by a piece of strategy of Peisistratus, who was

soon to become so famous. He conquered Nisaea, the port of Megara. The Athenians now had a hostage for Salamis. Megara agreed to submit to the arbitration of Sparta. In Sparta Solon advocated the Athenian claims with arguments very characteristic of the Greeks. He quoted sayings of the Delphic oracle, according to which Salamis was Ionic territory, said that the sons of Ajax, Philaeus and Eurysaces, had given Salamis to the Athenians, and finally stated that the mode of burial in Salamis was Attic. The Spartans decided on the merits: Athens had to give back Nisaea and received Salamis in its stead.

NOTES

1. The history of Athens is for us the history of Greece. Hence with us modern writers special treatment of Athenian history—apart from topography—is out of the question. The ancients, who lived in the midst of events which now appear to us as one connected whole, were able to deal with the history of Athens by itself, and have done so. They have naturally attached great importance to details. In the fourth volume of Müller's Fragments of Greek History, pp. 680, 681, there is a list of works on Athenian and Attic history and antiquities of which fragments or notices are preserved. First come the authors who have written an Ἀτθίς, and the older writers, Pherecydes (the Athenian) and Hellanicus, are improperly included among them. The Atthis writers are learned men of the periods following upon that of Aristotle. They are Cleidemus, Phanodemus, Demon, Androtion, Istrus, and especially Philochorus, who wrote also an abridgement of his own Atthis, and produced besides special treatises on Attic subjects. The constitution of Athens has been treated by Aristotle, Heracleides, and Dicaearchus (Müll. II.)

The discovery of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, which is beyond doubt the work ascribed to Aristotle by antiquity (1st ed. by Kenyon, Lond. 1891; latest and very useful edition by Sandys, Lond. 1893), has given a fresh impulse to the study of the history and constitution of Athens. The numerous treatises written on this work cannot be quoted here. It is sufficient to remark that most scholars consider it to be by Aristotle—their chief opponents being Rühl, Cauer, and Schwarz—that all are agreed as to its value for the study of antiquity (from Chap. 42 onwards), but that the first

historical section must, owing to the many new facts which it contains, be carefully examined before it can be accepted. The name of Aristotle ought not to prevent a criticism of the work on its merits. We must confine ourselves to indicating the points in which the *Ἀθ. Πολ.* is at variance with previous received accounts.

A very important work was the *Ψηφισμάτων συναγωγή* of the Macedonian Craterus. Of the Periegetae, who recorded and explained remarkable events in different localities, the most important were Diodorus (before 308) and Polemon ; fortunately we still have the Periegesis of Pausanias (2nd cent. of our era). Plutarch's biographies of Theseus and Solon are based for the most part on second-hand information.

Modern writers on early Athenian history approach their subject from three sides, and as a matter of fact it can be conveniently illustrated from three points of view : firstly, the investigation of myth and legend ; secondly, the study of ancient constitutional history ; and thirdly, topography and monuments. Of these three the first is, from the nature of the case, mostly of a subsidiary character and of secondary importance. In connected narratives stress is laid alternately on the second and third, with the aid of the first. The modern works on early Athenian constitutional history will be mentioned below ; for the present we will only note the progress made in recent times in the topographical history of Athens. Next to Leake's works (Topography of Athens, 1821 and 1841) comes Curtius with his Attic studies (1862 and 1865, Schriften d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss. XI. and XII.), his explanatory text of the seven plans of the topography of Athens (1868), and lastly, his contributions to the geography of Athens and Attica, Curtius und Kaupert, Karten von Attica (up to the present three parts have been published). Bursian has treated Athenian topography in his Geographie von Griechenland and in Pauly's R. Enc. I.[2] (1866), and Milchhöfer has done the same in Baumeister's Denkmäler des Alterthums (1884)—each in accordance with the results arrived at in their day. A very exact and exhaustive work is C. Wachsmuth's Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum, Erster Band, Lpz. 1874, Bd. II. 1, Lpz. 1890. Very suggestive is von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf's Aus Kydathen, Berl. 1880, in Kiessling's and von W.-M.'s Philol. Untersuchungen I. There are now two other books, Curtius, Die Stadtgeschichte von Athen, Berl. 1891, and Harrison and Verrall, Mythology and Monuments of Athens, Lond. 1890, which often reproduces the results of the investigations of Dr. Dörpfeld, the first living authority on Athenian topography. All these works display immense ingenuity in the treatment of the very earliest history of Athens, and, if space permitted, we should

have to discuss many points and to note as probable many of the conclusions which have been arrived at. The importance of inscriptions is beginning to make itself felt.

2. The welcome accorded to strangers in Attica is specially emphasized by Thuc. 1, 2. It is to be noticed that Eleusis and Salamis were not Attic from the very beginning. But when did they become so? That we do not know. We must not, however, exaggerate their independence. That of Eleusis especially had no bearing on foreign relations.

3. According to the opinion of some (notably Hermann, St. A. § 95) the accession of Ion to the throne was "the elevation of a warrior caste to the leadership of the Attic people." Hermann is inclined not to connect it with an invasion from outside, and in this he is certainly right. But the basis of the whole theory, the accession of Ion, is, in our opinion, of no historical value. It is merely an invention to account for the name of the people. If a military caste obtains power, it generally uses it to oppress the rest of the people, but there is no trace of this in Attica. Hence Hermann's "ionische Staatsveränderung" is not demonstrable.

4. Thuc. 2, 15 says ἐπὶ γὰρ Κέκροπος καὶ τῶν πρώτων βασιλέων ἡ Ἀττικὴ ἐς Θησέα ἀεὶ κατὰ πόλεις ᾠκεῖτο. In later times people professed to know that Cecrops had formed these cities, twelve in number (the names of which, with the exception of one acc. to Philochorus, are given in Strabo 397), into a synoecismus, which is even more mythical than the second one founded by Theseus. Cf. Plut. Thes. 24; Kansel, De Thesei Synoecismo, Marb. 1882.

5. Cecrops, Erichthonius and Erechtheus are creations due to natural myths. The struggle between Eumolpus and Erechtheus represents the historical opposition between Eleusis and Athens. Ion of course never really existed. An eponymous hero was wanted for the Ionians, and he was brought in the usual way from abroad (Ion, son of Xuthus, a brave man, and therefore ruler of Athens); while others considered this rather derogatory to Athens and made him simply son of Apollo and Creusa, the daughter of Erechtheus. Ancient worships come into play here; besides Poseidon the Ionians specially worshipped Apollo. It is just as impossible to extract history from the legends of the sons of Pandion, Aegeus, Pallas, Nisus, and Lycus, for Nisus and Lycus really have no connection with Attica, but are only used for the purpose of glorifying it (Megara and Lycia influenced by Attica); the Pallantidae are mythical giants and Aegeus is only a humanized Poseidon.

6. The formation of the city of Athens out of communities originally existing side by side and yet distinct from one another, has

been the subject of much study in recent years. Cf. esp. C. Wachsmuth's above-quoted work, Die Stadt Athen, in which he distinguishes between the Pelasgic settlement on the citadel, the Ionic settlement to the east of the citadel, the Thracian settlement to the south, and that of the Phoenicians and other foreigners in Melite. Phoenicians and Thracians are certainly dubious, and the name of Pelasgi does not seem to us happily chosen, but we share in the belief that a section of the population, which worshipped Athene and occupied the citadel, can be distinguished from another, which may be called Ionic. Curtius takes a somewhat different view in his Stadtgeschichte, p. 24 seq.

7. Acc. to Etym. Müller Εὐπατρίδαι, the Eupatridae lived in the city.

8. Procl. ad Hes. E. 492. It is not easy to perceive by what encroachment on existing rights the 360 tribes obtained property in the city of Athens.

9. For the Ionian Phylae we must refer the reader to the handbooks of ancient constitutional history. The opinion, which is shared by Petersen (Quaest. de hist. gent. Attic. Slesv. 1880), that the names only refer to Zeus, Hephaestus, Poseidon, and Athene as tutelar deities, appears to us to be well grounded.

10 and 11. For the founding of the republic, cf. Paus. 4, 5, 10; in 7, 2, 1, he makes Medon succeed to the monarchy, also in 1, 3, 2. The theory of the duration of the monarchy at Athens has been contested specially by Lugebil, Jahrb. f. class. Philol. Suppl. 5, 539 seq. That a change took place in the relations between the chief of the state and the state as represented by the nobles, is shown by the passage in Pausanias (4, 5, 10) regarding the transformation of the monarchy, εἰς ἀρχὴν ὑπεύθυνον. And it harmonizes with the usual course of the development of the Greek states that at a certain period the chief office in the state was subjected to greater control, whether the title of king was retained or not. We cannot however say by what methods this control was exercised. The dispute, whether there were kings or archons in Athens from 1069-683, is only a dispute about names, and possesses just as much importance as the determination of any particular fact carries with it; the nature of the government of Athens in those days is not affected by its title. We know how things went on in Poland for centuries, but it is a matter of indifference whether the Polish constitution be called monarchical or republican.

12. For the noble families in Athens, cf. Meier, De gentilitate Attica, Hal. 1834; G. Petersen, Quaestiones de historia gentium Atticarum, Slesv. 1880. The best authority now is Töpffer, Attische Genealogie, Berl. 1889.

13. The orator Andocides belonged, according to some writers, to the family of the Ceryci, according to others he traced his descent from Telemachus, who married Nausicaa.

14. We may see in the word θεσμοθέτης the idea of commander or ruler, corresponding to the conception which lay at the root of the position of a Roman magistrate. The theory of the constitution of the Greek state requires a good deal more elucidation.

15. The existence of a council of state in Athens seems to be confirmed by Ar. Pol. 2, 12, according to which Solon allows τὴν βουλήν to remain, but this appears from the preceding passages in Aristotle to be the Areopagus. In Plut. Sol. 12, Megacles is judged by 300 nobles. Duncker, 6, 121, calls the 300 an aristocratic community and a permanent council.

16. For Cylon Her. 5, 71; Thuc. 1, 126; Plut. Sol. 12; and now Arist. Ath. Pol., commencement; also Wright, The Date of Cylon, Boston 1892.

17. Legislation of Draco, Ar. Pol. 2, 9, 9 Δράκοντος δὲ νόμοι μέν εἰσι, πολιτείᾳ δὲ ὑπαρχούσῃ τοὺς νόμους ἔθηκεν. Especially περὶ τῶν φονικῶν. K. Fr. Hermann, De Dracone legumlatore Ind. Schol. Gott. 1849, 50.—For the Ephetae, Lange, Die Epheten und der Areopag vor Solon, K. S. Ges. d. Wiss. 1874, pp. 189 seq.; Philippi, Der Areopag und die Epheten, Berl. 1874. What, according to Aristotle's Ath. Pol., Draco did for Athens, I give in the words of Br. Keil, Berl. Philol. Wochen. 1891, No. 17 seq.: "Draco conferred the political rights, which had hitherto been confined to the aristocracy and the moneyed classes, on all who were able to provide themselves with arms at their own expense. The offices of the nine archons and the financial appointments could only be filled by citizens who could prove the possession of an unencumbered fortune of 10 minae. An aspirant to the offices of Strategus or Hipparch was obliged to have a similar fortune of 100 minae, and legitimate children over ten years of age besides. Such were the guarantees required by the state from responsible officials. The lower offices were open to all who bore arms. The legal age for all offices was thirty years. A council, the Boulé, was created, consisting of 401 members, who were elected by lot from the whole number of those in possession of political rights. The lower officials were also now elected. The highest (archons, finance officials, strategi, and hipparchs) were chosen by a show of hands (Cheirotonia). The power of the Areopagus, which had hitherto enjoyed the right of filling these offices, was now considerably limited. The community was (whether by Draco, is not stated) divided into four grades of taxation, the Pentacosiomedimni, Hippeis, Zeugitae, and Thetes. The poorer classes who could not prove

the possession of arms, were for the present deprived of all political rights, and forced by the stringent law of debt to submit to slavery at the hands of the propertied classes. Draco's constitution, therefore, made no change in this direction."

18. Herod. 5, 94, 95 ; Str. 13, 599, 600.

19. With the expedition to the Hellespont Athens begins to act on a great scale ; this is the first occasion on which she proves herself a maritime power of the first rank. Cf. also Töpffer, Quaestiones Pisistrateae, Dorp. 1886, p. 73 seq. Our scanty information about the preparations for it cannot alter our opinion respecting the fact itself. It is more than probable that the landed nobility, who had ruled Athens for centuries, were not disposed to attempt foreign expeditions of such magnitude ; the expedition implies the existence of an internal agitation, in which democratic elements must have acquired a decisive influence on foreign policy. The commerce of Athens and its exports, chiefly pottery and oil, must have been very considerable, even in the seventh century. Perhaps the silver mines at Laurium began to be worked then. They constituted an important reserve for Athens.

20. The received accounts and modern views of the war about Salamis differ. According to Plut. Sol. 12, Salamis was twice lost to the Megarians. The accounts of the participation of Peisistratus in the war against Megara are contradictory. According to Herod. 1, 59, it is certain that Peisistratus took possession of Nisaea as general shortly before his tyranny. Afterwards he was erroneously represented as taking part in the expedition of Solon (Plut. Sol. 18). The probability therefore is that Salamis was recovered by Solon alone the first time, and the second time by Peisistratus. Recently, however, many have come to the conclusion that one story is merely a replica of the other, in which case the conquest of Solon would have to be regarded as a legend. Cf. Meinhold, De rebus Salaminiis, Königsb. 1879 ; Duncker, 6, and Petersen, Hist. gent. Atticar. Slesv. 1880, p. 101 seq.

21. Decision respecting Megacles according to Plut. Sol. 12, *τριακοσίων ἀριστίνδην δικαζόντων.*

22. Epimenides slept in a cave for fifty-seven years, and subsisted on mallows and asphodel. Duncker has described his career in Sparta, where he is said to have been buried, on the strength of some ingenious conjectures of his own. On the other hand, Niese and Rohde consider him quite a fabulous personage, while Loeschcke in the Dorpater Universitätsprog., Dec. 1883, places him, following Plat. Leg. 1, 642, about 500 B.C. We have given our own opinion in a note to Chapter XXVIII.

23. Indebtedness of many Athenians, Plut. Sol. 13, 15. The

Hectemorii are said to have either paid or retained a sixth part of the revenue. The latter is evidently the correct version, but it was very oppressive. For the Seisachtheia, etc., cf. esp. the summary of Hermann-Thumser, § 66.

24. Plut. Sol. 6 certainly says that Solon had a son, but his history is very untrustworthy.

25. Solon was archon, Ol. 46, 3 ; Diog. L. 1, 2, 15. Plut. Sol. 14 and 16 says that Solon was twice appointed Nomothetes, but the first general mention of the word Nomothetes seems to include the second (contra Duncker 6, 156).—Seisachtheia, Plut. Sol. 15, following which most writers (even Philochorus, according to Phot. Suid. *σεισ.*) regard it in the light of a *χρεῶν ἀποκοπή*, Androtion in that of a reduction of the rate of interest, and an enhancement of the value of money.

26. Percy Gardner, Types, p. 9. Our knowledge of the Athenian currency in Solon's time is by no means so exact as even handbooks nowadays generally represent it to be.

27. The anecdote about the friends of Solon (Plut. Sol. 15) who were in the secret of his projects, and speculated in landed property and other securities, shows that such things are not of modern origin.

28. For the problems connected with the Solonian constitution, cf. the new editions of the Staatsalterthümer of Hermann-Thumser, which have appeared since the discovery of Aristotle's Politeia, Gilbert and Busolt, as well as Br. Keil, Die solonische Verfassung in der aristotelischen Verfassungsgeschichte Athens, 1872. For the four Solonian classes, see Arist. quoted in Harp. *ἱππάς*—*Σόλων εἰς τέσσαρα διεῖλε τέλη τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος Ἀθηναίων, πεντακοσιομεδίμνους καὶ ἱππέας καὶ ζευγίτας καὶ θῆτας.* Cf. Plut. Sol. 18. The number 150 for the Zeugitae rests upon a law interpolated in Dem. 43, 54. Plut. has 200, compare Ar. et Cat. I. Boeckh has some acute remarks on the way in which the various classes were induced to pay their contributions ; cf. Gilbert, St. A., I., p. 133. —For the composition of the Areopagus, Plut. Sol. 19 *ἐκ τῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀρχόντων.*—How little we can prove the legendary authority of the Areopagus by definite facts is shown by a glance into the manuals of antiquity, *e.g.* Gilbert 1, 264 seq. Duncker (6, 187-94) has drawn an ideal picture of the Areopagus as it should be.—The *βουλή* of the Four Hundred, Plut. Sol. 19.—Powers of the popular assembly, Ar. Pol. 2, 9, 4 *ἐπεὶ Σόλων γε ἔοικε τὴν ἀναγκαιοτάτην ἀποδιδόναι τῷ δήμῳ δύναμιν, τὸ τὰς ἀρχὰς αἱρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύνειν.*—The Heliaea is designated by the *ἔνιοι* mentioned in Ar. Pol. 2, 9, 2, as the democratic element of the Solonian constitution : *τὸν δὲ δῆμον καταστῆσαι, τὰ δικαστήρια ποιήσας ἐκ*

πάντων. For the Heliaea, cf. Fränkel, Die attischen Geschworenengerichte.—For the Naucrarii, Phot. ναυκραρία and Gilbert, St. A. 1, 134. The ἔξοδοι γυναικῶν were regulated by Solon, according to Plut. Sol. 21. The laws of Solon in all departments of public and private life are described in detail by Duncker 6, Bk. 12, Part 13.—For the ἄξονες and κύρβεις, Plut. Sol. 25, and (an elaborate account) Hermann, St. A. § 107, 1. The law enjoining partisanship, Plut. Sol. 20. In Hermann's St. A. § 106 seq., there is a very full collection of passages from ancient authors, and references to modern works on the subject of Solon's life and work. Cf. Busolt, G. G. 1, 519 seq. His most enthusiastic admirer is Duncker, who calls him "the greatest political genius of antiquity" (6, 198). His greatest achievement, according to Duncker (6, 197), was "saving the Attic peasantry, and making them the foundation of the community." Duncker himself admits that the latter was only partially successful. We have our doubts whether the Seisachtheia is sufficient to prove him to be the greatest political genius of antiquity. The Solonian constitution ought to have been a protection against tyranny, but it was not so. And when the Peisistratidae were gone, Cleisthenes came and made other changes of a very thoroughgoing description. Forty years after its promulgation, Solon's constitution was only of historical interest. Arist. Ἀθ. Πολ. c. 22 makes just the same remark: συνέβη τοὺς μὲν Σόλωνος νόμους ἀφανίσαι τὴν τυραννίδα, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους θεῖναι τὸν Κλεισθένην στοχαζόμενον τοῦ πλήθους. On the other hand, the personality of Solon will remain interesting for all time. And this is often the case in Greek history. The particular political achievement is often a complete failure, while the force of character and the originality which gave it birth are generally worthy of all admiration. This truth is often not grasped, and gifted scholars endeavour to represent the actions of the Greeks as wise when they were only well meant. This is apt to produce a reaction, which exaggerates in its own way, and makes out the Greeks to be worse than they are. (Cf. Schvarcz in his clever work, Die Demokratie, Leipz. 1882.) Solon has had much the same fate as his Areopagus, concerning which we learn much that is new in the Ἀθ. Πολ., but little that is clear. There is a general consensus of opinion that Solon was the greatest legislator and the Areopagus the most august court in antiquity; and if little was left of Solon's constitution in the fifth century, and the power of the Areopagus was not very perceptible, yet good citizens could always appeal to them as realized ideals, and this was of great service to Athens and to the civilization of antiquity in general.

29. For the Sacred War, cf. Schol. Pind. Pyth. Arg., Strab. 9,

418 ; Plut. Sol. 11 ; Paus. 2, 9, 6 ; 10, 37, 4 seq. ; Polyaen. 3, 5 ; 6, 13. Kallisth. quoted in Ath. 13, 560 c. Cf. Möller, D. Kris. Krieg, Progr. d. Danz. Realsch. 1866 ; Niese in the Histor. Untersuchungen, dedicated to A. Schäfer. Its ten years' duration appears to be legendary. An important part was played by the hereditary hatred of the Thessalians for the Phocians. Cf. Busolt, Gr. G., I. 489.

CHAPTER XXVII

ATHENS UNDER PEISISTRATUS AND HIS SONS

Solon is said to have fixed ten years as the period within which his laws were to undergo no change; according to others, a hundred years. The latter is absurd, the first is intelligible, if we look upon it as a period of probation. He himself spent the time abroad. The city did not stand the period of probation well. Internal dissensions became so acute, that in the fifth and tenth years after Solon's departure the post of first archon could not be filled, and the archon Damasias remained in office for two years and two months, whereupon ten archons were elected instead of nine for the following year.[1] On order being nominally restored, three distinct parties were formed, each under the leadership of distinguished nobles—the Diacrii, whom Plutarch designates as the democratic party; the Pediaei, or oligarchical party; finally the Parali, or moderates. The leader of the Pediaei was Miltiades, who was succeeded by Lycurgus, the former a Philaid, the latter probably a Butad; the leader of the Parali was Megacles, an Alcmaeonid, and of the Diacrii Peisistratus, who claimed descent from old Nestor, and had already rendered great service to his native city by the conquest of Nisaea. The state of feeling in Athens was not what it should have been so soon after the passing of a great measure of reform; universal discontent prevailed. The nobles felt that they had lost too much, while the people thought they had not gained enough. The party-leaders

made use of this discontent for their own selfish ends. Solon grasped the situation more clearly than any one, and endeavoured to open the eyes of the people, at first by poems, and afterwards in speeches. But it was all in vain. When he had feigned madness in his youth he had been regarded as wise; now that he was old and talked sensibly he was pronounced childish, and not listened to. His previsions were soon fulfilled. One day Peisistratus appeared in his chariot in the popular assembly, covered with blood and alleging that he had been attacked and wounded. On the motion of Ariston the people resolved with the consent of the council to assign him a guard of fifty club-men. He obtained more than fifty, and seized the citadel. He thus attained what Cylon had failed to accomplish, and became tyrant of Athens.[2] Solon had opposed the movement up to the last moment, but his power of resistance was gone. He placed his arms outside the door of his house as a sign that he was defenceless; but he refused to become a subject of Peisistratus. He went to Cyprus, where he soon died; he is said to have ordered his ashes to be conveyed to the island of Salamis, and there scattered to the winds. Other leading men also left Athens, among them Miltiades. Certain Dolonci from the Thracian Chersonese came to Greece to seek assistance against their hostile neighbours, the Apsinthii. As they passed through the streets of Athens, Miltiades, who was sitting outside his door, invited them into the house as his guests. This, according to an oracle, was a sign to them that he should be their king. He consented, and many noble Athenians accompanied him. Miltiades became not only king of the Dolonci, but tyrant over the Greek cities of the peninsula. These party quarrels at Athens were only a struggle for power; there were no principles at stake; if Peisistratus was to be tyrant of Athens, Miltiades would at all events have the same position in the Chersonese. The removal of inconvenient rivals suited Peisistratus well enough. But there was another

reason for the occupation of the Thracian Chersonese by an Athenian. We know that Athens had already established herself in Sigeium; the Thracian Chersonese commands the Hellespont from the European side, and with it the entrance to the Black Sea. It is plain that Miltiades and his successors still considered themselves as Athenians in their new quarters, and promoted the interests of Athens. The selection of Miltiades by the Dolonci for their king was no doubt not the result merely of an oracle, but of mutual acquaintance and a comprehension of the situation by both sides.

The reign of the Athenian tyrant was not of long duration. Lycurgus, the new leader of the aristocrats, made common cause with Megacles, and Peisistratus deemed it advisable to yield. His property was confiscated, and was purchased by Callias, a *Daduchus*. But the alliance between the victors did not last. Megacles, who had little political insight, thought it advisable to come to an understanding with Peisistratus. He proposed to hand over the government to him on condition that the latter married his daughter, to which Peisistratus consented. To avoid a struggle a singular trick was resorted to. A woman named Phyé of the deme Paeania, was dressed up as the goddess Athene and placed by Peisistratus' side in a chariot, and the pretended Athene conducted the ruler to the Acropolis amid the applause of the people. But the understanding was of short duration. Megacles, who felt his inferiority to Peisistratus, joined the aristocratic party a second time, and Peisistratus was forced to leave Athens after a rule of only one year. He did not come back at once, but when he did so, he made use of open force. He succeeded in making foreign alliances in Argos, Thessaly and Eretria, and in obtaining the aid of an enterprising fugitive from Naxos, by name Lygdamis.[3] In 538 he appeared with an army on Attic territory, at Marathon, in the neighbourhood of which among the mountains many of his old adherents, the Diacrii, lived. The ruling party in Athens was unprepared. The armies

met at Pallene, on the south-eastern slope of Pentelicon. Peisistratus attacked his opponents when they were resting after the mid-day meal, and they were speedily put to flight. The conqueror wisely avoided useless bloodshed, and entered Athens with the defeated army. Some of the aristocrats belonging to the hostile party emigrated; those that remained were obliged to give hostages. A direct tax, amounting to one-twentieth part of the yearly income, was imposed on the Athenians, of course only on the first three Solonian classes, which made it not displeasing to the lower orders, upon whom Peisistratus chiefly relied. The tyrant understood how to use his foreign connection to the utmost advantage. Lygdamis was appointed ruler in Naxos, and the Athenian hostages were placed under his charge. With the assistance of Lygdamis, Polycrates made himself tyrant of Samos. Thus three tyrants of Ionic race obtained the control of an important line of coast and of islands stretching across the Aegean Sea from Europe to Asia. Peisistratus himself occupied a strong position at the mouth of the Strymon, and recovered the Athenian settlement of Sigeium, which had fallen into the hands of the Persians and Lesbians. He appointed Hegesistratus, his son by a third marriage, governor of the place. He showed his interest in the religious centre of the Aegean, the island of Delos, by carrying out a purification of the holy ground by means of the removal of all graves from the vicinity of the temple of Apollo.

Peisistratus left the forms of the Athenian constitution unchanged, and only provided that his family should be represented in the college of archons. He succeeded in securing a majority in the council and in the assembly by skilful management of the people. He even appeared as defendant before the Areopagus. It is true that his accuser took fright and made default in appearance. Like all wise tyrants he devoted attention to the wellbeing and the amusement of the people. The founding of the gymnasium in the Lyceum (if

really his work), the construction of pipes for the spring Callirrhoë, the name of which was changed to Enneacrounos, the erection of a temple of Apollo on the Ilissus, and of the Parthenon on the citadel, all reflect honour on Peisistratus. Another building planned by him was not completed, the temple of Zeus on the Ilissus. The roof was to be borne by a hundred and twenty columns, more than sixty feet in height; it would have rivalled the colossal temples of Ionia.

Peisistratus promoted the splendour of public worship in general. He is credited with the founding of the Panathenaea. This festival was celebrated every fourth year. The chief function was a procession, at which a harvest-wreath and a new scarlet robe, woven by virgins and adorned with pictures, were offered to Athene Polias. The frieze of the Parthenon contains a free reproduction of this procession. The contests were of the same character as those at Olympia, the prizes being an olive twig and a jar of oil. Jars decorated with black figures are still extant, representing the warrior-goddess Athene or men running, and bearing the inscription, "I am one of the prizes won at Athens."

Other worships were amplified during this period, especially that of Dionysus. Festivals in honour of the god of wine had existed from time immemorial in Attica. One of the most important was the rural Dionysia, held in late autumn in the month of Poseideon. Sacrifices, festal processions and dances entertained the country folk, the dance on slippery wine-skins creating great merriment. In the city the Lenaea were celebrated somewhat later, in the month of Gamelion, and on the southern side of the Acropolis. The Anthesteria came in February, when vegetation is beginning. Lastly, the festival of the Great Dionysia, the splendour of which constantly increased, was celebrated about the time of the vernal equinox. The drama of the sixth century originated in these festivals of Dionysus. Dithyrambs relating the exploits of the god were sung in his honour. An actor related the incidents,

while a chorus added its remarks. The chief home of the cult of Dionysus in Attica was the district of Icaria, where Dionysus had taught Icarius, with whom he lodged, the cultivation of the vine, whereupon the peasants killed Icarius, and his daughter Erigone hanged herself. Thespis, who was considered the first tragic poet of the Greeks, was a native of this district. These representations were transferred from the rural Dionysia to the city festivals, particularly to the Lenaea and the Great Dionysia. The performances were not confined to the exploits of Dionysus. Here too the main interest was supplied by the prize competition between the choruses, who performed different pieces specially composed for them. The prize was a tripod, which the victor did not keep, but set up as a dedicatory offering in a public place for a permanent record of the event.

But Attica was not only the country of Athene and Dionysus, it belonged also to Demeter and Persephone. No place in Greece could rival Eleusis in this respect. It was here that Demeter came in search of her daughter; here she had taken service in the house of Celeos, and endeavoured to make his son Demophon immortal. Then she had revealed herself and demanded worship, and when her wrath had abated, she instructed the rulers of Eleusis, Triptolemus, Eumolpus, Deocles and Celeos, in the sacred mysteries, the so-called orgies, which could be communicated only to the initiated. The hidden meaning of her teaching was clearly that just as Persephone returned from the lower world to her mother, so not only will the corn sown in the earth sprout forth anew, but mankind also will overcome death.

But there was another myth connected with that of Demeter and the maiden, the myth of a Dionysus, son of Zeus and Persephone, who was torn to pieces by the Titans, as the Egyptian Osiris was by Typhon, and like him was restored to life. In Athens this Dionysus was called Iacchus, whilst at Eleusis he appeared by the side of Demeter and the

maiden. Hence the Eleusinia became pre-eminently a festival of the lower world. It was celebrated in autumn in the month Boedromion, under the direction of the archon Basileus and Eumolpidae, Daduchi and Ceryces. On the 19th day of Boedromion, many thousands of people accompanied the image of Iacchus from Athens to Eleusis. Here nocturnal torch-dances of the initiated took place in the meadow called Callichorus; then the actual ceremonies were celebrated. They comprised, as the ancients said, fasting, the quaffing of *cyceon*, and taking things out of a chest and placing them in a basket, and *vice versa*. A bright light piercing the darkness was a symbol of the hopes of the initiated. In the sixth century philosophical poets endeavoured to explain the symbolical meaning of these mysteries, which were famous throughout the whole of Greece. Thus the Athenian Onomacritus argued that mankind had to rise from the grossness of the Titan to the spiritual nature of Dionysus. The fate of Orpheus corresponded to that of the mystic Dionysus; and therefore Onomacritus ascribed his poem to Orpheus. Other poems referring to initiation were attributed to the ancient bard Musaeus. All these things found great favour with the people. The shortcomings of the state religion were keenly felt by them, and so every one supplemented the deficiency according to his inner needs, by the ceremonies of the mysteries, by philosophical theology, or by a combination of both. There arose a number of semi-religious, semi-philosophical sects. The Orphici laid most stress on religion, while the Pythagoreans represented the philosophical side. These methods of supplementing the state religion lasted till the downfall of paganism, and though they originated in serious convictions, yet imposture soon crept in and gained ground as time went on. The Phrygian mother of the gods, Demeter, Dionysus, Isis and Mithra represented at various epochs of antiquity symbols which attracted earnest religious aspirations, and were used by impostors for their own

ends. Peisistratus, who patronized Onomacritus, was not so exclusively absorbed in religion as to forget poetry; he ordered the Homeric poems to be recited at the Panathenaea, and, as tradition states, appointed a commission to revise the text of Homer, of which Onomacritus, Orpheus of Crotona, and Zopyrus of Heracleia were members. Verses in praise of Athens are said to have been fraudulently interpolated into the Homeric text on this occasion.

When Peisistratus died in 528 B.C., he was succeeded by the sons of his first marriage, Hippias and Hipparchus. They reigned after the manner of their father, and like him encouraged intellectual pursuits. The court poets were reinforced by Lasus of Hermione, who managed to supplant Onomacritus by proving that the latter had made interpolations in the collection of the poems of Musaeus undertaken by order of Peisistratus. Simonides of Ceos, who won his greatest fame at a later period, and Anacreon of Teos, who had at first graced the court of Polycrates of Samos, also lived in Athens at that time, under the special patronage of Hipparchus. Hipparchus is also said to have ordered the proper sequence of the poems to be observed at the recitation of Homer during the Panathenaic festival. He was also the first to set up Hermae with inscriptions at various places in Attica. The reigning family had of course no lack of opponents. Their relations with the Philaidae were of a fluctuating kind. Cimon, a cousin of Miltiades, was permitted to return to Athens in 528, after having named Peisistratus as victor at a contest won by himself at Olympia. But when he had his own name called out on a similar occasion in 524, Hippias had him assassinated. Yet the younger son of the murdered man was allowed to enter upon the Thracian inheritance. This was the victorious hero of Marathon. If there seems a want of consistency in the treatment of the Philaidae, we must remember that they were not so dangerous as the Alcmaeonidae, who were not more courageous, but certainly

more crafty, and also richer, especially since Alcmaeon's piece of buffoonery with Croesus. And they knew how to spend their money at the right moment, a policy which all wealthy families aiming at political power do not understand. They undertook to build the Delphic temple for 300 talents, but by using marble, which was not stipulated for in the contract, they did far more than was required of them, which enhanced their own renown and that of Athens, and won them the valuable support of the Delphic priests. The Peisistratidae sustained two severe losses by the overthrow of Lygdamis in Sparta and Corinth in the year 524, and shortly afterwards by the death of Polycrates. But the death of Hipparchus was a still heavier blow. A feeling of revenge, due to causes of a private nature, prompted two nobles, Harmodius and Aristogeiton, to enter into a conspiracy, in which, however, only a few took part. The murder of the two tyrants was planned to take place at the Panathenaic festival. But the mistaken idea that Hippias had been warned led the conspirators to attack Hipparchus alone, whom they murdered. Hippias with great presence of mind disarmed the citizens, who were carrying lances on account of the festival, and thus saved his life and his throne (514 B.C.) He endeavoured to make the latter more secure by stricter administration of the finances,[4] and increased severity, so that the tyranny became more oppressive than before.[5] The attempt of Cleisthenes, the Alcmaeonid, to establish himself at Leipsydrion to the south of the Parnes range probably occurred about this time; he had, however, to abandon the position with considerable loss.[6] Abroad, in spite of the loss of Naxos and Samos, the connections of Hippias were still influential, especially in the north, where the Thessalian princes and the king of Macedonia were on friendly terms with him, and his brother Hegesistratus remained governor of Sigeium, while the son of Hippoclus, tyrant of Lampsacus, was the husband of Hippias' daughter. Hippoclus was an adherent of the Persians, and

Hippias too might hope to maintain his position by means of their friendship.

The interference of Sparta in Athenian affairs brought about his overthrow at last. The Spartans displayed all their old bodily vigour and political power in the latter half of the sixth century, but at the same time exhibited an inability to grasp the general situation, and a want of consistency in the conduct of foreign policy, which in the case of an aristocracy are only comprehensible when its training is as onesided as that of the Spartan. A nation which aspires to make its mark in history cannot afford to neglect the civilizing tendencies of the age.

When Cyrus was at war with Croesus, the Spartan power was so considerable that their intervention in Asia might have given the war another termination ; but they contented themselves with issuing orders without seeing that they were carried out. They even kept on decidedly friendly terms with the Persians for nearly half a century. And it is true that from the point of view of their own security they might have remained indifferent to what was going on in Asia. After the humiliation of Argos, and the annexation of the greater part of Arcadia, they had the supreme command of a confederacy which could put more than 40,000 hoplites into the field. The latter might be called out at any moment without mention of the object, but in important cases their consent was obtained beforehand by means of assemblies summoned to Sparta, in which a majority was valid against separate members of the league, but not against Sparta. Sparta was sovereign of the league. Even at that time she had the direct control of a third of the Peloponnese. Her policy favoured aristocratic forms of constitution, and was hostile to tyrannies on principle, but personal advantage always outweighed principle.[7]

About a quarter of a century after Sparta's somewhat ignominious intervention at Sardis, she attempted to interfere in the affairs of the islands, and with not much greater success. In Samos a noble, named Polycrates, had seized the

government; he massacred the unarmed citizens at the festival of Hera, and put down further resistance with the aid of Lygdamis (537 B.C.)[8] He speedily rose to great power, devoting his energies specially to the creation of a formidable fleet, by means of which he subdued many of the islands and even some cities on the coast of Asia Minor. He fought with success against Lesbos and Miletus; and his power was compared with that of the tyrants of Syracuse. He controlled the Aegean, which was only open to his own commerce and that of his friends, especially the Naxians and Athenians. He consecrated the island of Rheneia to the Delian Apollo, and made the cruel Arcesilaus III. governor of Cyrene. Amasis of Egypt was his ally. He was fond of building, both for practical purposes and for show; his splendid palace, the restoration of which was a dream of Caligula, was world-renowned. He acclimatized foreign animals, and collected manuscripts and works of art—his signet-ring engraved with a lyre, the work of the Samian Theodorus, was much admired. He attracted to his court learned men like the physician Democedes, poets like the Rhegian Ibycus and Anacreon of Teos, the celebrated singer of love and wine. His unscrupulousness—he put to death one of his brothers and deprived even his friends of their property, saying that they ought to be grateful if he restored it to them—helped him for a time over all difficulties. It was the time of the rise of Persia's power. Cambyses attacked Egypt, the ally of Polycrates. The tyrant of Samos saw on which side superiority lay, and made the necessary change of front. He offered Cambyses his fleet by naïvely asking why he had not applied to him for ships as well as to Lesbos and Chios. He is also said to have begged Cambyses not to let the ships, which he had manned with Samian citizens, return. But on arriving at Carpathus the Samians mutinied, and turning homeward blockaded Polycrates in his citadel. The tyrant repulsed his assailants, who thereupon appealed to Sparta, their request being sup-

ported by Corinth. The latter in her capacity of commercial power had every reason for putting an end to the career of Polycrates. Hitherto Samos had always followed the lead of Corinth, but now she was siding with Athens and carrying on a system of state piracy in the Aegean. A force composed of Spartans, Corinthians, and exiled Samians appeared before Samos. But on this occasion also Polycrates' luck did not desert him. In forcing an entrance into the city two Spartans met with a glorious death, and the allies withdrew without having effected their object. Polycrates now seemed invincible. And as a matter of fact he only perished by his own folly. Oroites, the Persian satrap in Magnesia on the Maeander, who, as it appears, had long been on the look-out for an opportunity of destroying the impudent Greek, laid a trap for him. He pretended that he had to take to flight, and that he had great treasures of which Polycrates might have a portion, and that for security's sake he should come and fetch them himself. Polycrates first sent his confidant Maeandrius, who was deceived as to the contents of the chests, and then went in person to Magnesia, where he was taken prisoner and crucified. To put oneself in the power of a Persian simply in order to take delivery of eight chests of gold seems somewhat silly for a ruler in the position of Polycrates; but fortunately the craftiest egotists often have a weak point, which makes them ready to fall into a clumsy trap.[9] Maeandrius, to whom Polycrates had entrusted the government of Samos during his absence, offered to restore the citizens their liberty on reasonable terms. But these were not accepted, and Maeandrius remained tyrant for a time. Meanwhile Darius had ascended the throne. He put Oroites to death (Bagaeus' mode of procedure as related by Herodotus seems to have been in the mind of Tiberius on the occasion of the assassination of Sejanus), and established Syloson, a brother of Polycrates, as tyrant in Samos. Maeandrius was compelled to take flight.[10]

The supremacy of Persia in the west of Asia Minor was strengthened by the expedition against the Scythians. Darius returned to Asia, but by his orders Megabysus continued to make conquests in Europe. The Greek cities of Thrace were subdued; then Macedonia was invaded, and its king Amyntas submitted, and gave his daughter in marriage to the son of Megabysus.

In the south also the Persians encroached on Greek territory. Arcesilaus III. had made himself ruler in Cyrene with the help of Polycrates. He and his father-in-law Alazeir of Barca sent assistance to the last Psammetichus, king of Egypt, against the Persians. But after the victories of Cambyses Arcesilaus and Alazeir submitted, and were subsequently slain in Barca. The mother of Arcesilaus, Pheretime, sought aid of the Persian governor in Memphis. The Persians conquered Cyrene, Barca, and Euhesperides, and included them in the satrapy of Egypt. But Battus IV. and Arcesilaus IV. continued to reign in Cyrene. Arcesilaus III. and Pheretime were tyrants of the worst description; things could not have been worse under the direct rule of Persia.[11]

Maeandrius now endeavoured to incite Sparta against Persia. At this time the most influential of the two Spartan kings was Cleomenes, son of the Agiad Anaxandridas, who had been obliged to take a second wife by order of the Ephors, because his first had borne him no children. The second wife gave birth to Cleomenes, but shortly afterwards the first wife was delivered of Dorieus, and subsequently had two other sons, Leonidas and Cleombrotus. King Ariston divorced his own wife for the same reason as Anaxandridas, and took that of a Spartiate, and Demaratus was the fruit of this new union. He afterwards became king, but did not remain so until his death, as was also the case with Cleomenes. On the latter's accession, which took place somewhat earlier, Dorieus had to leave the country. He went to the Syrtes and to Sicily, but

was harassed by the Carthaginians in both countries ; he was driven out of Africa by them, and met his death in Sicily.[12]

Cleomenes, to whom Maeandrius had shown some costly vases inherited from Polycrates, was afraid that some of the Spartans might be open to a bribe, and made the Ephors expel the dangerous stranger. His interest was more centred in European politics. It is probable that the aristocracy of Megara, which had been overthrown for a time, was now re-established. The poet Theognis, who drew a picture of it and of himself in his elegiacs, belonged to this party. But an aristocratic régime in Megara brought the formidable power of Sparta in dangerous proximity to Athens, especially dangerous to Hippias, for although the Spartans were by no means fond of fighting for a mere principle, yet they prided themselves, and with some show of reason, on having overthrown tyrannies whenever they had been able to do so. Yet under certain circumstances they were capable of using tyrants as allies. Hippias was aware of this, and therefore made a close alliance with Sparta.[13] His enemies, however, did not lose heart. The Alcmaeonidae increased their offerings to the Delphic shrine, and thus whenever Sparta or any Spartans wished to obtain something in this quarter, the invariable reply of the Pythia was that the tyranny in Athens must be overthrown. There were of course influential people in Sparta who had the same aim. The Spartans at length yielded to these constant warnings, and sent a small force under Anchimolius to Attica. He landed at Phalerum. Hippias had a thousand Thessalian cavalry as auxiliaries, who fell upon the Spartans and repulsed them, Anchimolius being killed in the engagement. The Spartans had now to retrieve their honour. Cleomenes in person led them into Attica, where he was joined by the exiled Athenians, especially by the Alcmaeonidae. At first the Thessalians were beaten, and they hastily retreated to their own country. Hippias was besieged in the citadel. He was, however, well supplied with provisions,

and the Spartans would have had to retire had not chance come to their aid. Hippias wished to send some of his children abroad for safety, and they fell into the hands of the enemy. Hippias feared that their lives were in danger, and was ready to take any step to save them. He left the citadel and the country and went to Sigeium.

NOTES

1. For Damasias cf. the decisive passage in Aristot. Pol. 13 and the works on the Athenian constitution which have been several times quoted.

2. Beginning of the government of Peisistratus Herod. 1, 59 ; Plut. Sol. 29, 30 ; Marm. Par. ep. 41. Acc. to Ar. Pol. 5, 9, 23, of the 33 years from 560-528 only 17 were actual years of Peisistratus' reign, for the second exile lasted about 11 years (Herod. 1, 62), and the first 5 years. For the chronology cf. Duncker, 6, 454 ; Unger in the Jahrbuch f. class. Phil. 1883 and Busolt, Gr. G. 1, 551, who assigns the years 560 to about 556 to the first tyranny ; 555-551, exile ; 550-549, the second tyranny ; 549-539 or 538, exile. The chronology of the *Ἀθην. Πολ.*, which differs from that in the Politics of Aristotle, has created fresh difficulties, and there is less agreement than ever as to the dates of the reign and the exile of the tyrant. Cf. the frequently quoted works on the Athenian constitution, and Toepffer, Quaestiones Pisistrateae, Dorp. 1866, p. 541 ; also Caner, Parteien und Politiker in Megara und Athen, Tüb. 1880. — Government of Peisistratus, Herod. 1, 60 seq. ; Ath. 13, 609 ; Herod. 6, 34 seq. (Miltiades). Character of his rule Thuc. 6, 54 ; Ar. Pol. 5, 9, 21. Founder of the Olympieum, Ar. Pol. 5, 9, 4 ; of the Pythium, Suid. s.v. *Πύθιον* ; of the Lyceum, Theop. quoted in Harpocr. s.v. *Λύκειον* ; other adornments of the city Thuc. 2, 15 ; Paus. 1, 14, 1 ; his library, Ath. 1, 3 A. Revision of the Homeric poems, see von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, Homerische Untersuchungen. Institution of the Panathenaea, Schol. Aristid. 323 Dind. The rule of Peisistratus is analogous to that of the earlier Medici in Florence. A concealed tyranny is more corrupting to a nation than an open one.—For the rule of Hippias, the murder of Hipparchus etc., Thuc. 1, 20 ; 6, 54-59 ; Herod. 5, 55-56 ; 62-65. Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 18 makes Thessalus, the brother of Hipparchus and Hippias, play the part which according to previous accounts

was played by Hipparchus. The narrative does not by any means carry conviction.

3. For Lygdamis, Ar. Pol. 5, 5, 1 ; Polyaen. 1, 23, 2 ; Plut. Ap. Lac. 64. According to Herod. 1, 64, he was only Peisistratus' administrator in Naxos.

4. Permission to have porticoes in the street on payment of a certain sum, enhancement in the value of coins withdrawn from circulation, purchase of immunity from public duties, Ar. Oec. 2, 2, 5.

5. Just as the tyranny of the Peisistratidae recalls that of the earlier Medici, so the conspiracy of Harmodius and Aristogeiton reminds us of that of the Pazzi, in which Lorenzo, like Hippias, managed to save himself by his presence of mind. In Athens the murder is carried out during the most important festival, in Florence in the cathedral during High Mass. Posterity has meted out different treatment to the Athenian and Florentine conspiracies, the Athenian one, for very intelligible reasons, receiving more than its deserts : ἐν μύρτου κλαδί etc.

6. The attempt in Leipsydrion, Herod. 5, 62.

7. Busolt, Die Lakedaimonier und ihre Bundesgenossen, Bd. I. Lpz. 1878. The date of the accession of each state is not always demonstrable.

8. For Polycrates of Samos, Herod. 3, 39-60 ; 120-125 ; Diod. 10, 15 ; Ar. Pol. 5, 9, 4. For the chronology cf. Duncker, 6, 512, and Busolt, G. G. 1, 602.

9. In unscrupulousness Polycrates rivals Dionysius ; the story about his friends' property is even worse. His end shows that he was really an ordinary man. Dionysius had as little desire as Polycrates to benefit his nation ; but he did so because he was a clever statesman. Polycrates' achievements were quite ephemeral. He deserves attention as does every striking personality. He is in the main a successor of the old Carians, pirates on a grand scale, like the buccaneer chiefs or the Vitalian brothers, who also had a taste for beautiful things.

10. Syloson, the Persians at Samos, Maeandrius in Sparta, Cleomenes, Herod. 3, 139-149. Bagaeus, Her. 3, 126-128.

11. For the history of Cyrene to the time of Arcesilaus III. Herod. 4, 159-167.

12. Anaxandridas and his sons, history of Dorieus, Herod. 5, 39-48.

13. The Peisistratidae ξεῖνοι of Sparta, Herod. 5, 63 and 91. Duncker (6, 553) conjectures that they did not become so till the end. But there is no necessity for such a theory. The fall of the Peisistratidae related by Herod. 5, 62-65.

CHAPTER XXVIII

ATHENS IN THE LAST DECADE OF THE SIXTH CENTURY

THUS Athens regained her freedom in the year 510 B.C., about the same time that Rome shook off the rule of the Tarquins. But the two cities, which had for some time exhibited a strikingly parallel development (Servius Tullius = Solon, Tarquinius Superbus = the Peisistratidae), now entered on different paths.

Before his departure Cleomenes left the Athenians a disagreeable legacy. The Theban hegemony was not popular with the Boeotian cities, least of all with the Plataeans, who at that moment were being harassed by Thebes. They applied to Cleomenes for protection; but he refused their request, saying that Sparta was too far off, and advised them to place themselves under the protection of Athens. His object was to save Sparta from the odium of interfering in Boeotian affairs, and to throw it on Athens. The Plataeans followed his advice, and in solemn form asked Athens for protection. Their petition was granted, and the Thebans in consequence declared war. Corinth was asked to arbitrate, and decided that the Boeotians who did not wish to belong to the Boeotian league might secede from it. The Thebans would not agree to this; they attacked the Athenians and were defeated. The result was that the river Asopus became the boundary between Theban territory on the one hand, and

Plataea and Hysiai, which had also attached itself to Athens, on the other.[1]

In Athens the antagonism between democracy and aristocracy was at once accentuated. The struggle, however, did not last two centuries as in Rome; it was decided in little more than two years, owing to the fact that one of the nobles required the aid of the people. This was the Alcmaeonid Cleisthenes. He had been mainly instrumental in overthrowing the Peisistratidae, and yet in spite of this another noble, Isagoras, one of those who had not emigrated, was elected first archon for the year 508. If such devotion as his was counted so lightly by the aristocracy, then the constitution might become a democratic one for all he cared. The character of Cleisthenes resembled in some respects that of his maternal grandfather. If he wanted power and could not obtain it by means of an understanding with the nobles, there was nothing left for him but to go over to the democracy and come to the front as its leader. The changes introduced by Cleisthenes gave the Athenian constitution a democratic form.[2] By what methods he accomplished this is unknown to us. His proposals, which had received the sanction of Delphi, were accepted by the people.

The basis of his reform was a re-division of the people. Hitherto there had been four phylae, in which the nobles had the most power by reason of their control of the sacred places. The Council of Four Hundred was composed of members of these divisions. The political organization of the people was based upon the historical coherence of its individual members. This was not favourable for the democracy; it would have been better for it if, as Aristotle says, the individuals had been mixed up together as much as possible.[3] Cleisthenes grasped this fact in a masterly way. He made the existing groups of dwellings, the villages, or demes, the basis of the new political organization, and gave them an independence which they did not possess before by entrusting them with the

control of the civic franchise, which had hitherto been in the hands of family associations. Thus the management of political matters relating to the status of private individuals was handed over to local corporations, which was a step in the right direction. But affairs which directly concerned the state were not to be decided by the votes of people living in the same neighbourhood. The phylae were still to exist, but they were not necessarily to be composed of neighbouring demes. The members of them were scattered over the whole country. The election of the members of the Council was left to assemblies of men who were not in all cases neighbours. The organization of the demes and their distribution into phylae was of course the work of Cleisthenes. The necessary religious sanction was given by the Delphic oracle, and the new phylae were invested with even greater dignity than the old ones by being placed under the special protection of famous heroes. They were called Erechtheis, Aegeis, Pandionis, Leontis, Acamantis, Oeneis, Cecropis, Hippothoontis, Aiantis and Antiochis, after the four most famous of the old Athenian kings, Cecrops, Erechtheus, Pandion and Aegeus, after Acamas, who represented his father Theseus, after Leos, whose daughters sacrificed themselves for their country, after Hippothoon, prince of Eleusis, after Antiochus, a son of Heracles, the hero of Marathon, after Oeneus, a son of Pandion, and lastly, after the Salaminian Ajax. The members of the phylae met in Athens for the transaction of their business. Each phyle selected fifty members of the Council, which henceforth consisted of five hundred instead of four hundred members. Cleisthenes gave proof of his dictatorial authority by granting the rights of citizenship to many foreigners and freedmen. The importance of the new phylae was further increased by the fact that the real government of the state was carried on for the tenth part of the year by the fifty councillors belonging to each phyle. These fifty men, named Prytanes, were obliged to remain constantly together

during the thirty-five to thirty-nine days for which their authority lasted. The presidency was changed every day, the Epistates of the Prytanes being at the same time president of the popular assembly with the support of his colleagues.

We have no direct information concerning many of Cleisthenes' probable reforms. But one innovation is certainly his, that of ostracism, a peculiar means of protection for the democracy. Every year the people had to be asked if they wished to banish any one for the space of ten years. If they replied in the affirmative, a special vote was taken to decide who was to undergo the penalty, and if as many as 6000 votes were recorded, the man who obtained the majority of them was banished. This measure was intended to prevent any attempts at a tyranny. It was not, however, always used with this object; there was no suspicion of the kind in the case of Aristides. Ostracism became a weapon of party politics, and served the purpose of silencing a dangerous opponent. From either point of view it was a measure of doubtful propriety. To expel a man from his native country on the mere suspicion of unconstitutional designs, is an inequitable proceeding in an age when that country was the only place where it was possible to lead a life worthy of the name; and if the aims of a political opponent can only be counteracted by banishment, it amounts to the same thing as using force. It was true that ostracism was the invention of a man whose democratic tendencies must not be taken too seriously.[4]

It is not likely that all these reforms were introduced by Cleisthenes simultaneously. Ostracism was probably not introduced until his innovations had been followed by a reaction of the aristocrats. When the latter saw their helplessness they appealed to the Spartans, who considered that their own authority was at stake. A pretext for intervention was found in religion. Sparta demanded at the mouth of a herald that the Athenians should banish the descendants of

those who were under a curse. Cleisthenes was the great grandson of the Megacles who had committed sacrilege against the persons of Cylon's adherents. The herald was followed by Cleomenes at the head of an army. It seems no concern of Sparta's, but she interfered as the leading state of the whole of Hellas, and the Hellenes recognized her in that capacity. Cleisthenes yielded to force.[5] Isagoras gave the names of seven hundred heads of families to be exiled for their political opinions, and they were expelled by Cleomenes. The new council of five hundred was to be replaced by a still newer one of three hundred. But this was the signal for failure. The five hundred refused to submit. The people grew restless, Isagoras surrendered the citadel to the Spartans, and Cleomenes entered the Erechtheum. The priestess of Athens ordered him to withdraw, as no Dorian was allowed to enter. The prohibition was easily evaded : " I am no Dorian, but an Achaean," said Cleomenes ; and no one who believed in the existence of the Heraclidae could help regarding Cleomenes as an Achaean. The king carried off the collection of oracular sayings made by Musaeus, but he failed to subdue the Athenian people. They besieged the citadel, and in three days the Spartans were ready to treat. They capitulated, gave up their Athenian allies, with the exception of Isagoras, and left the country. This was a disgraceful proceeding, although not so bad as we should think. The Spartans were always astonishingly practical in matters of this kind, for they had no need to prove that they were incapable of fear. But they were all the more bound to have their revenge. For this purpose Sparta collected not only her own men and her Peloponnesian allies, but also the Thebans and the citizens of Chalcis. The courage of the Athenians failed them. They had recalled Cleisthenes, but now it seemed that only one man could help them, and that was the king of Persia. They sent ambassadors to Artaphernes at Sardis. He demanded absolute submission, and the ambassadors were so perplexed that they consented. But in

Athens regard for national honour prevailed; their action was repudiated and war was resolved on.

It was probably in the year 506 B.C. that the frontiers of Attica were overrun by the enemy. The Athenians marched to the front with their whole force. The enemy cut down the sacred grove at Eleusis, and laid waste the holy precincts. No battle, however, was fought. The coalition fell to pieces. The first step was taken by the Corinthians, who had already showed friendly feelings towards Athens in the matter of Plataea. The allied forces had been called out without being specially informed of Sparta's object. The Corinthians now discovered that the destruction of Athens was aimed at, and this did not meet their views; moreover, they were troubled about the outrage at Eleusis. They therefore withdrew. Cleomenes shared the command with his colleague, Demaratus, who said he did not wish to have anything more to do with a campaign that was ending in failure, and also departed—jealousy being of course his real motive. Thereupon the rest of the Peloponnesian allies turned homewards; and finally Cleomenes withdrew with his Spartans, full of rage against Demaratus. The result of the campaign is inexplicable but for the assumption that the gold of the Alcmaeonidae must have influenced some of those who took part in it. The Athenians were now opposed by the Boeotians and Chalcidians, who were thus left in the lurch, and they defeated both. The Chalcidians became the victims of their own folly and of that of other people. They were compelled to remodel their constitution in a democratic fashion, and to surrender most of their land to Athens, which was distributed among 4000 Athenians. This was a profitable war for Athens. The Spartans had hardly made more out of the first Messenian war. The 4000 *Cleruchi* remained Athenian citizens.

It seems strange that a small state should have selected this very time, during which Athens rose to such power, for making a markedly hostile demonstration against her. The

Thebans could not submit patiently to their defeat. They were anxious to find allies, and with this view appealed to Delphi. Delphi replied that they should seek aid of their nearest. But who were their nearest? The expression in the mouth of a god must refer, as a clever Theban discovered, to the relationships of the heroic ages. The sister of Thebe was Aegina, both daughters of Asopus; hence they were to ask Aegina for help. This was evidently the object of the Thebans, who wanted an excuse for inciting Aegina against Athens. At first the Aeginetans decided to pay them back in their own coin. The son of Aegina was the pious Aeacus, whose sons were Peleus and Telamon. The desired "nearest ones" were therefore Peleus and Achilles, Telamon and Ajax, and so the Aeginetans sent their images to Thebes. But the images did not have the desired effect.[6] The reason might be that the presence of Ajax gave the assistance a dubious character, for he was really more of an Athenian. Thebes returned the statues and asked for men, which Aegina granted. There happened to be people in Aegina who wanted war with Athens, and for that reason joined in the religious farce, without which the people could not have been persuaded to declare war. Moreover, statues had already been the cause of a quarrel between Athens and Aegina.

Aegina had been colonized by Epidaurus and therefore at the outset was on friendly terms with that city. But subsequently a change took place. The Epidaurians had once during a famine been advised to erect images of olive wood to Damia and Auxesia. As the most sacred olive trees were in Attica, they had asked Athens for the wood, and had received it on condition that they showed their gratitude by offering annual sacrifice to Athene Polias and Erechtheus on the Acropolis. They performed their engagement, but were drawn into a war with the Aeginetans, who despoiled them of these statues. The Epidaurians then declared that they

were no longer under obligation to perform the promised sacrifice, and told the Athenians to apply to the Aeginetans. The Athenians demanded that the images should at all events be restored. The Aeginetans refused and a war broke out, in which Aegina was supported by Argos. The Athenians landed and penetrated into the centre of the island, where the images were erected, but they had fallen into an ambush in which they all perished.[7]

Aegina gradually became an important commercial power. The Aeginetans traded in the Black Sea, and had a settlement of their own in Naucratis[8]; after the fall of Phocaea they even continued the commerce of that city in the Adriatic and with Tartessus. They became very rich, and were noted for the number of slaves which they maintained; manufactures and arts flourished among them, and they created a fleet of eighty triremes. There was a long-standing feud between Aegina and Samos. Some Samian aristocrats, being unable to effect a return to their native country even with the assistance of Sparta and Corinth, had taken the town of Cydonia in Crete from the Zacynthians and had settled there. The Aeginetans defeated them by sea, took Cydonia from them, sold them as slaves and settled in Cydonia in their place. The Aeginetans sometimes convey the impression that they tried to make up for the smallness of their country by the recklessness and unscrupulousness of their proceedings. A famous monument of their artistic skill is still preserved in the temple of Athene, on the eastern side of the island, with twenty columns still standing; the groups on the pediments, which were discovered in 1811 and set up in Munich, are remarkable for careful execution of the human figure, combined with a certain stiffness of attitude and a typical rigidity of countenance.

Aegina was wealthy, powerful at sea, and on bad terms with Athens. She acceded to the request of the Thebans, and did her best to injure Athens. The Aeginetan fleet fell

upon the coast of Attica without any previous declaration of war, and destroyed the harbour of Phalerum as well as many villages. The Athenians applied to Delphi for advice. They were told that they must wait for thirty years and then consecrate a temple to Aeacus, after which their attack would be victorious. If they made their attack at once they would have alternations of success and failure, but would conquer in the long run. They at once consecrated a temenos to Aeacus, and were preparing for a vigorous war with Aegina, when they had to defend themselves against a more formidable danger.

In Sparta things had assumed an aspect which promised badly for the Athenians.[9] People there had come to the conclusion that they had been too hasty in quarrelling with the easy-going Peisistratidae at the instigation of the Pythia, and in assisting the Alcmaeonidae, who had turned out to be much worse. The war had brought little glory and no profit. But what was to be done? After Athens had been conquered —and there was no doubt on this point—who was to reign there? The simplest plan after all was to reinstate Hippias. The Spartans sent for him and introduced him to the members of the league. They explained that they had been induced to expel the Peisistratidae by lying oracles, that the Athenians had behaved ungratefully, and had ill-treated the Boeotians and Chalcidians, and that Hippias must be reinstated to prevent a recurrence of such proceedings. Sparta, however, expected too much from her allies. All the allied states were under an aristocratic form of government, and now they were required not merely to tolerate a tyrant but to replace him on the throne! The Corinthians declared themselves opposed to this policy. If Herodotus is to believed, they regarded the matter from a moral point of view. The world would be turned upside down, and earth and sky change places, if the Spartans were to establish a tyranny, the most abominable thing on the face of the earth! And thereupon

Sosicles, the spokesman of the Corinthians, expatiated on the enormities of the Cypselidae. It was of no avail for Hippias to dwell on the practical side of the question; the general feeling was against him, and his cause was abandoned. Henceforth he could only rely on Persia, and it was Persia that now threatened Athens.

In Greece nothing of importance happened before the outbreak of the great conflict with Persia, except that Argos experienced a recurrence of ill-fortune. It must have been about the time when Miletus was destroyed. But the defeat of Argos has no connection with the struggle between Greece and Persia. It is referred to here because it completes the picture of the political aspect of Greece just before the Persian wars.[10]

Argos had long been obliged to give way to Sparta and surrender her supremacy bit by bit. The battle of the 300 had resulted in the loss of the Thyreatis; but now the very existence of the state was in danger. The war, the immediate cause of which is not known to us, was conducted by Cleomenes on behalf of the Spartans. The Pythia had revealed to Cleomenes that he would take Argos; the Argives had received one of the usual right-in-any-event answers. Cleomenes' first plan was to march on Argos by the land route, but at the passage of the river Erasinus the sacrifices were unfavourable, and he sent for ships from Sicyon and Aegina, against the wishes of the Sicyonians and Aeginetans, and landed near Tiryns and Nauplia. The Argives were surprised at a meal, which they had begun when they heard the Spartan herald give the signal for dinner. They were defeated, and many fled to the neighbouring grove sacred to the hero Argos. Cleomenes set fire to the grove, and the fugitives, to the number of 6000, were burned with it. He then realized that the prophecy had been fulfilled, and that he would not take the city of Argos. He returned to Sparta and there defended his conduct successfully before the Ephors. The Argives' story was that he had attacked

the city, but that the troops who entered it, like king Demaratus himself, had been repulsed by the women, and that this was commemorated in Argos by the festival of Hybristica, at which the men appeared dressed as women and the women as men. Argos was crippled for a long time, a fortunate circumstance for the Greeks during the Persian wars.

NOTES

1. Plataea, Athens and Cleomenes, Herod. 6, 108. According to Thuc. 3, 68, the union of Plataea with Athens must have taken place in the year 519 B.C. But since the appearance of Grote's history this has rightly been regarded as a mistake, as Cleomenes did not come to Boeotia so early. The chronology of events in Greece at the end of the sixth century and until 492 B.C. (first campaign of Mardonius) can only be determined by combinations, and not by direct records.

2. For Cleisthenes, Herod. 5, 66, 69 seq. The names of the Phylae Poll. 8, 110. Events in Athens—Isagoras, interference of Sparta, withdrawal of the Spartans, defeat of the Thebans and Chalcidians, the Theban request for help from the Aeginetans, Herod. 5, 70-81. The accounts of Arist. Lys. 274 and the Scholia appear to be exaggerated. Herodotus regards Cleisthenes throughout as a party-leader and egoist (*τὸν δῆμον προστθέμενος*). Relations between the Aeginetans and the Athenians, 5, 82-89.

3. Ar. Pol. 6, 2, 11 speaks of this intermingling—*πάντα σοφιστέον, ὅπως ἂν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀναμιχθῶσι πάντες ἀλλήλοις αἱ δὲ συνήθειαι διαζευχθῶσιν αἱ πρότερον.* According to Ar. Pol. 3, 1, 10, *Κλεισθένης πολλοὺς ἐφυλέτευσε ξένους καὶ δούλους μετοίκους.*—Ostracism introduced by Cleisthenes, Philoch. Fr. 79 (Müller I.) Ar. Pol. 3, 8, 6 says in reference to ostracism that it *ταῖς παρεκβεβηκυίαις πολιτείαις ἰδίᾳ συμφέρει.* Cleisthenes' work much emphasized by von Wil.-Möllendorff in his Kydathen. The continuance of the four Ionic phylae for matters connected with family law is now pretty generally accepted.

4. Even in antiquity ostracism was only imitated in Argos, Megara, Miletus and Syracuse (Petalismus) without any known result. Aristotle (Pol. 3, 8, 6) is right; it is better if there is no need for such laws. Ostracism perhaps suits the artificial character of Cleisthenes' constitution. In the present day no one who defends it in Athens would approve of it in his own country. But

one cannot help admiring the acuteness displayed by the Greeks in their attempts to give form to their ideals of law and politics, which are not always the same as ours. There is an element of greatness in this intellectual effort.

5. Everything connected with the Κυλώνειον ἄγος is uncertain. Who were the guilty? Why was the matter not settled by Epimenides? Why were the Alcmaeonidae never able to remove the stain at Delphi? The following conjectures seem probable. When the wrong was done, the Athenians failed to propitiate the Pythia. They expiated the crime as well as they could, but how we do not know. The Pythia never forgot that she had been ignored, and used this mistake of Athens to enforce her own authority when the occasion suited her. Afterwards even the Alcmaeonidae could not repair the consequences of the original blunder, for the Pythia would not give up such an excellent means of displaying her power for the sake of anybody. In later times they got out of the difficulty in Athens by asserting that the famous Epimenides had made a most satisfactory settlement of the matter at the time. But who knew for certain whether there ever was such a person living at that time?

6. It would appear from this that Herodotus makes a mistake in saying μετὰ ταῦτα (5, 79), and that the Thebans had already received the Aeacidae on a previous occasion. According to Ael. Var. Hist. 6, 1, only 2000 Cleruchi came to Chalcis.

7. For the disaster which happened to the Athenians in Aegina, cf. Duncker, 6, 248, who places it in 568 B.C. Unless ἔχθρη παλαιή rests on legends of a much earlier date! The reference to a change of dress seems to me to point to this.

8. For the commerce of Aegina, Herod. 7, 147, 178; Strab. 8, 376. Aegina and Samos, Her. 3, 59.

9. Sparta and Hippias, Herod. 5, 90-93.

10. The Argives and Sparta, Herod. 6, 76-83; Plut. Apophth. Lac. Cleom. 2, 4, 17; Plut. Mul. Virt. 7; Polyaen. 8, 13; Suid. Telesilla; Paus. 3, 4, 1; 2, 20, 8. Cf. Busolt, Die Laked. p. 332 seq.

END OF VOL. I

Printed by R. & R. Clark, *Edinburgh.*

14

4 Vols 20/-

(Vols. I + II,
Out of Print)

DF214 .H74 v.1
The history of Greece from its
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00022 2259